This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

60000085151P

42.

250.

CATHOLICITY v. SIBTHORP;

OR,

SOME HELP TO ANSWER THE QUESTION,

WHETHER

THE REV. R. W. SIBTHORP, B.D.

IS NOW OR EVER WAS

A CATHOLIC?

In a Series of Five Letters,

ADDRESSED TO HIM

By THE REV. G. E. BIBER, LL.D.

Presbyter of the Anglo-Catholic Church.

CATHOLICITY v. SIBTHORP;

OR,

SOME HELP TO ANSWER THE QUESTION,

WHETHER

THE REV. R. W. SIBTHORP, B.D.

IS NOW OR EVER WAS

A CATHOLIC?

IN A SERIES OF LETTERS ADDRESSED TO HIM

BY

THE REV. G. E. BIBER, LL.D.

Presbyter of the Anglo-Catholic Church.

Letter the First.

LONDON:

F. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD; AND

WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;

AND JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

1842.

250.

LONDON:
Printed by Maurice and Co., Fenchurch Street.

TO

THE REV. R. W. SIBTHORP.

SIR,

SOME time ago your secession from that Church of which you had long professed yourself a member, and in which you had, up to the very eve of that secession, continued to exercise ministerial functions, filled the timid with alarm, the ignorant with wonder, and those who had taken cognizance of your previous career, a career by no means as "unobtrusive" as you seem to imagine, with painful regret, to see their fears for you too fully realized. Could you have rested content to make that change in silence and privacy, there is no doubt that beyond the noisy clamour of journalists, no molestation would have been experienced by you; your case would only have continued to excite the compassion of many, and to draw forth the prayers on your behalf of not a few, in the Communion from which you had, to your own hurt, separated yourself.

But you seem to have determined otherwise. No sooner have you become a deserter from the camp which had so long reckoned you as one of its soldiers, than you appear before its ramparts as an aggressor; sounding a trumpet of uncertain but shrill note, and summoning the whole host from whose ranks you have so recently withdrawn, to follow the example of your desertion. Under such circumstances it can hardly need an apology, that any soldier of that camp, to whom his allegiance, and the cause in which he bears arms, are dearer than his life, should step forth, and denounce your summons as a treasonable appeal.

"Is there not a cause?" was of old the plea of a champion of God's Church; my plea for now addressing you is the same. In doing so I have no wish, as I can have no motive, to say any thing calculated to wound your feelings; at the same time I am sure you will agree with me, that a controversy such as that to which you have challenged the Anglican Church, can be conducted, profitably and faithfully, only upon one principle, the principle enunciated by the Apostle in these words: "Let God be true, and every man a liar." Upon this principle, while disclaiming all intention to say one word that shall be needlessly offensive, I must claim the privilege of using great plainness of speech in what I shall have to say.

I am sorry to be compelled, at the very outset, to bring against you the heavy charge of coming before the world, in your late publication, under what is commonly termed "false pretences;" and that in two ways. First, you profess to write in mere self-defence, with an anxiety that "the Spirit of truth and charity" might "guide your pen;" while in reality you make a direct aggression upon the Church whom you have already so deeply wronged by your unfaithfulness, and support your attack by charges and insinuations as far removed from the truth, as they are from that charity which "hopeth all things" and "believeth all things." Secondly, the very title of your pamphlet contains an untruth by implication; for the inquiry made of you no doubt was, "Why you had become a *Roman Catholic?*" whereas you publish, not *an* answer, but, in the true spirit of the Communion you have recently joined, "*some* answer, to the inquiry 'why are you become a *Catholic?*'"—thus assuming upon the very title-page, by a *petitio principii* which runs through the whole of your performance, that which you ought to have been careful, under the peculiar circumstances in which you are placed, to assert only after you had established it, in your own opinion at least, by solid argument.

Of this last-named article, indeed, there is confessedly a remarkable dearth in your Letter,

which amounts to no more than a discursive statement, made up partly of insinuations, partly of assertions, the former unproven, the latter unsupported; artfully so contrived that an impression shall be left on the minds of the ignorant and unwary, without leading them to scrutinize the grounds on which that impression rests, while the better informed and the wary shall be at a loss to determine what, precisely, it is that they have to grapple with. Those who, in the new position you have assumed, have a right to be "better judges than yourself" of what you ought to do, have no doubt judged wisely that to bring the points at issue between their Communion and ours into direct, open, unreserved controversy, would not be a course likely to serve their ends: but as the cause which I am advocating will be a gainer in proportion as those points are prominently brought forward, and fully discussed, I must beg leave to handle the subject in a more definite, articulate, and argumentative manner. With this view I will now state briefly the plan which I intend to pursue in examining and refuting that *portion* of your reasons for becoming a *Roman* Catholic, which you have condescended to communicate to us, inviting you at the same time, by all means to give us *the whole* of those reasons, if you think them tenable. From the evidence supplied by yourself I propose to show,

1. That you never were a sound member of the Anglican Church, from which you have seceded, and whose Catholic character your misrepresentations prove you to have been incapable of apprehending;

2. That you have not any correct conceptions of the Church of Christ, and consequently nothing to guide you in your search after the true Church;

3. That your notions of the Roman, or, as you term her, the Catholic Church, have no foundation in history, any more than warrant in Scripture.

These propositions I shall support by exposing, one after another, your *misrepresentations* of the Anglican Church, your *fallacies* respecting the Church of Christ, your *assumptions* concerning the Roman Church; and having done so, I shall thereupon proceed farther to argue, *on the one hand*, that to make out your case, viz. that you have "become a Catholic," you ought to have proved, that the Anglican Church is uncatholic, that the Roman Church is Catholic, and that you have quitted the former and joined the latter on Catholic grounds; nothing of which, it will appear, has been done by you;—*on the other hand*, that having proved you to have been uncatholic while a member of a Catholic Church, to have joined

an uncatholic Church, and that upon uncatholic grounds, I have fully made out my case, viz. that you "are not now, nor ever were, a Catholic."

The first point, then, which I undertake to establish, is that *you never were a sound member of the Anglican Church, from which you have seceded, and whose Catholic character your misrepresentations prove you to have been incapable of apprehending.*

This I propose to show upon two distinct grounds; 1. From the state of mind in which you describe yourself to have been, when you received her holy orders;

2. From the misrepresentations of her constitution and system, with which your Letter abounds, and which I shall successively notice.

As regards the state of mind in which you describe yourself to have been, when you received holy orders in the Anglican Church, I cannot do better than transcribe the following passage from your Letter:

"You are aware that *in early life I sought admission into that*" [the Roman] "*Church*, and, but for the interference of the law, being then under age, should have joined her. Though upon the closest scrutiny of my own heart, I am *not conscious of insincerity in my past profession of Protestant principles as a Clergyman of the Established Church*, yet I freely confess that the

remembrance of devotional feelings I then had, (almost the first meet to be so called which I remember to have had,) *never entirely quitted me during subsequent years. I never forgot what had forcibly impressed me, leading to the effort I then made to join the Catholic Church,* the apparent devotedness to religious duties, the supreme place which these seemed to have in their regard, the cheerfulness, yet earnestness of piety, which marked some members of her Communion, whom I then met with. I had found little of these things among my Protestant acquaintance,—my misfortune, doubtless; but so it was. Conceiving that religion, if any thing, should be the chief thing with every man; knowing it, on divine authority, declared to be 'the one thing needful;' when I seemed to find it so esteemed by Catholics, and knew it not to be so esteemed by most of my Protestant acquaintance, but holding quite a secondary and accidental place in their regard, *I not unreasonably judged these latter wrong, and those right. I sought to connect myself with the former in the enjoyment of privileges they alone seemed to understand and value.* My after acquaintance with both has shown me how much error there was in my estimation of them;—that all Catholics are not in earnest, nor all Protestants indifferent about their salvation: far otherwise. *Still an impression, and, in the main, a correct one, remained on my mind,* that there was among members of the Catholic Church a dedication to the claims and duties of Christianity, an admission of the influence of their belief upon their ordinary life and devotions,—a sort of absorbing interest in their religion, which sustained in me *a lingering affection towards them,* while I openly

condemned what I honestly believed to be the errors of their creed. I often mourned that truth seemed to have less power than error (for such I long judged the distinctive Creeds of Protestants and Catholics) to make men devoted to their God; and I could not but *affectionately regard* those whose religion appeared to be not a cold profession of faith, but an influential principle of daily life,—a source of animating hope, warm charity, lively devotion, and zealous efforts to make others partakers of the same benefit. *How far these sentiments and feelings co-operated to my present position,* God alone can judge."

I have given this long extract, containing the whole of your own statement upon this matter, in order to avoid all chance of misrepresentation, as it will be my duty to found upon it a heavy personal charge against you,—the charge of insincerity, in taking upon you the solemn vows and obligations of a Clergyman of the Anglo-Catholic Church.

You say, as if in anticipation of that charge, that you are "not conscious of insincerity" in this matter; and as far as a deliberate purpose of imposing upon our Church in your profession of her principles is concerned, the judgment of charity will most readily acquit you of it. But you, who have no doubt often pressed upon your hearers the lamentable fact that "the heart is deceitful above all things," cannot be so great a novice

in Christian ethics, as not to know that besides that grosser insincerity, which consists in knowingly and wilfully practising upon others, there is a subtler kind of insincerity, which leads a man first to deceive himself, and then, under shelter of this self-deception, to act a dishonest part. Of this latter kind of insincerity, I fear you will find it difficult to procure for yourself an acquittal even before the tribunal of your own conscience, if you will follow me in placing side by side the state of your mind as above described by yourself, and the state of mind which our Church in her formularies clearly shows that she pre-supposes in those who present themselves as candidates for her holy orders,—the feelings and impressions which never entirely quitted you, and the convictions which by implication you avowed, the professions which you openly made, at your ordination.

Your mind seems, by what you state, to have been in a most unsettled, wavering condition. So strong was your impression that the Roman Church alone, to the exclusion of the Anglican, the Church in which you took orders, understood and valued the privileges of religion, that you actually made an effort to join her Communion; and it does not appear that a deliberate conviction of the errors of Rome had any share in making you desist from that effort. It is true

that afterwards you say you "honestly believed" her creed to be erroneous; but at the very same time an impression remained on your mind, that in the Roman rather than in the Anglican Church, the fruits of the Spirit were to be found. Now with the discriminating principle, "By their fruits ye shall know them," before your eyes, it certainly must have struck you, that if Rome was in error as you believed, the fruits you thought you discerned in her, could not be genuine; and *vice versâ*, that if her fruits were genuine, and those fruits, as you supposed, wanting in the Anglican Church, the latter and not Rome must be in error. A suspicion must have attached, either to your Anglican doctrine, or to the fruits of piety in the Roman Church, or to both; and without a clear and satisfactory resolution of this doubt, it was not possible for you, in truth and sincerity, to enter into communion with either Church, much less to seek admission to her orders. The point on which the lingering affection of your heart, the continued impression of your mind, secretly misgave you, was one far too important to be left an open question in your soul, while you made the emphatic declarations, and took upon you the solemn vows, contained in our ordination service.

In that service you solemnly, as in the sight of God, declared "that no foreign prince, person,

prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm."

Could you, I ask, in real sincerity take this oath, while there remained any trace in your mind of those impressions, upon which you "judged not unreasonably" the Anglican Church to be in the wrong, and the Roman, whose most distinctive character it is to claim for her Bishop ecclesiastical and spiritual jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence and authority all over the world, to be in the right?

In that service you farther affirmed that you trusted yourself to be "inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this Office and Ministration," that is to say, the Ministry of the Anglican Church.

Of what nature, I ask, could have been the trust which you then expressed, seeing that you had previously sought admission to the Communion of a Church who has pronounced her anathema against this very office and ministration which you now sought, not conscious, you say, of any insincerity, at the same time that you freely confess that your early prejudices in favour of that Church "never entirely quitted you?"

In that service you further expressed your belief that "you were truly called, according to the

will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the due order of this realm, to the Ministry of the Church."

How, I ask, is the belief that the due order of this realm is consonant with the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, in regard to the Ministry of the Church, compatible with your not unreasonable judgment, never wholly revoked in your own mind, that the Church of this realm is wrong, and the Roman Church right?

In that service you promised "reverently to obey your Ordinary and other chief Ministers of the" [*i. e.* the Anglican] "Church, and them to whom the charge and government over you should be committed, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions."

How much, I ask, of godly sincerity could there be in this promise of reverent obedience and glad submission, when there remained in your heart a "lingering affection," an "affectionate regard," for a Church who treats the Ordinaries and other Chief Ministers of the Anglican Church as heretical intruders into an office, to which, if the Roman Church be right, they have no claim nor title?

In that service, after you had for a season exercised the office of a Deacon, and so had an opportunity of making yourself practically acquainted with the duties and responsibilities of your ministry, after you had been solemnly ex-

horted by the Bishop to consider with yourself "the end of that Ministry towards the spouse and body of Christ," you renewed the solemn declarations and promises before made, and you further engaged to "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word."

Did it not, I ask, occur to you that this promise had a direct tendency to pledge you to a position of hostility against a Church, who seemed to you "alone to understand and value" the privileges of the Christian state, of whose genuine dedication to the claims and duties of Christianity so strong, and, as you affirm it to have been, in the main, so correct an impression still remained on your mind?

In that service you humbly knelt before the Bishop, to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost by the imposition of his hands, accompanied with these solemn and authoritative words: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy Sacraments, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

Dared you, I ask once more, to approach this holy rite, dared you to present your head to the Bishop's hands on so awfully solemn an occasion, while there remained a lurking suspicion in your heart, that the Roman Church who claims to be the exclusive fountain for the dispensation of these powers, might be right, and that the Anglican Church might be wrong, in which case that solemn service in which you were engaged, would resolve itself into a blasphemous mockery?

After this twice repeated inconsistency of your conduct, after the inconsiderate, undecided state of mind in which, at the very best, you must have taken upon you such solemn vows and obligations, preceded by the Subscription of our Articles and Liturgy,—can you venture to state that "upon the closest scrutiny of your own heart you are not conscious of insincerity?" Can you venture to set your standard of sincerity so low, as to acquit of insincerity one who with the most evidently conflicting sentiments dwelling upon his mind, hesitates not to make declarations, and to enter into engagements, which presuppose a decided view of the matter on which he is so undecided; and that under circumstances which, if any, call upon him well and carefully to weigh every word which he himself pronounces, or to which he yields his assent? Is it too much to say, that instead of questioning how far the sen-

timents and feelings favourable to the Roman Church which never entirely quitted you, might have "co-operated to your present position," it were more appropriate for you to ask yourself, how far the unconscious insincerity of taking Orders in the Anglican Church with such a leaning as you felt towards the Roman, may have co-operated to induce in your mind that blindness to the real character of both the Anglican and the Roman Churches, and to the heavenly and spiritual character of the mystical body of Christ, of which your Letter affords such lamentable proof? Of this, too, "God alone can judge," and in the hands of His judgment I leave the matter; contenting myself with the conclusion necessary to my argument, and fully warranted by the premises, that the state of mind in which by your own showing you took holy Orders in the Anglo-Catholic Church, was not calculated to make you a sound member or minister of that Church.

I now proceed to notice the misrepresentations of the Constitution and System of the Anglican Church, which your Letter contains, and which clearly prove that her Catholic character was never apprehended by you. Before, however, I enter upon the separate points to which those misrepresentations severally refer, it will be necessary for me to advert to a singular confusion of

ideas which runs through your publication, and renders it rather difficult to determine, to what extent precisely you stand chargeable with misrepresenting our Church. In some passages you draw a distinction between the Anglican Church and the various Protestant Communions by which she is surrounded at home and abroad; and you state with a considerable degree of accuracy the lines of demarcation by which the former stands distinguished from the latter: in other passages, on the contrary, you speak of the Anglican Church as one of the countless Protestant sects, and you impute to her by implication all their sins, as if of them our Church had made herself a partaker. The consequence is, that it is often difficult to say, whether you are contrasting with the Roman Church, or rather with your ideal conception of her, the Anglican Church from which you have seceded, or the general crowd of denominations who take refuge under the negative appellation "Protestant." Such a want of distinctness is in itself very undesirable, because it confuses the argument; but in the present instance it is more than undesirable, it is extremely unfair, because it diverts the argument from its proper and legitimate course. Your Letter professes to be written for the purpose of giving some of "the reasons of your secession from the Anglican to the [Roman] Catholic Church." In

doing this you are of course fully justified in bringing forward every point upon which the two Churches are at issue, and I only wish you had gone into those points more fully; but it is not justifiable that you should rake together the errors and excesses of all classes of heretics and schismatics whom the Anglican Church disavows, and then, confounding her with them under the common term "Protestant," should adduce those errors and excesses among the reasons which induced you to secede from her, and to unite yourself to the Roman Church. To the question whether it were right for you to forsake the Anglican and to join the Roman Communion, the tenets and practices of "Prussian Lutherans, French Calvinists, and Swiss Socinians, of Independents, Baptists, Quakers, Shakers, of Irvingites and Plymouth Brethren, of Methodists of the Old and of the New Connexion, of New Jerusalemites and Primitive Revivalists," are just as relevant as would be the doctrines of the Koran, or the rites of Juggernaut. However defective may be the state of the Churches, and however extravagant the follies of the sects, here enumerated by you, those defects and those extravagancies could never constitute, upon any sound principle of reasoning, a ground for your secession from the Anglican Church, who is not in communion with any of them, whose funda-

mental principles are essentially different from theirs, and who coincides with most of them probably in a far smaller number of points of doctrine and discipline, than she has in common with the Roman Church.

Why, then, do you introduce the names of all these churches and sects? why do you put forth so much declamation about the notion of "Protestants," that "the Church must be allowed to consist of all denominations," in a dispute with which, being exclusively between the Anglican Church which you left, and the Roman Church which you joined, they have nothing whatever to do? Two solutions might be offered to account for this strange proceeding of yours. It might be said, that feeling the weakness of your cause as between the Anglican and the Roman Church, you availed yourself of the ambiguity of the term "Protestant," for the purpose of diverting the reader's attention from the points really at issue, to points foreign to the argument; and such, whether you intended it, or not, will undoubtedly in many cases be the effect. Or, it might be said, that you yourself, having but an imperfect apprehension of the character, and a most deficient knowledge of the principles of the Anglican Church, had permitted yourself, while in communion with her, to view her in the equivocal light of a Protestant denomination, and that the

deplorable confusion of your present statements was no more than the natural consequence of those latitudinarian views and feelings by which some of our Clergy made themselves at one time so painfully conspicuous, and with which, however much you might now deprecate them, you were yourself once infected.

Which of these two suppositions is the true one, you yourself ought to know best. A more accurate knowledge of your own ministerial career in the Anglican Church, and of the different phases through which you passed, than I possess, might possibly assist the inquiry. As it is, in the absence of sufficient data from which to form my opinion, I prefer leaning to that conclusion which is most accordant with the judgment of charity; and therefore,—dismissing from my mind the supposition that you might purposely have introduced the motley crew of "Protestant denominations," with a view intentionally to vilify the Anglican Church, and to make your worse appear the better reason,—I will, if you please, in the remarks I shall have to make, assume, to the disparagement, it may be, of your intellect, but to the credit of your heart, that you were led so utterly to confound the whole of your argument, by a vague notion of 'Protestantism' which in your mind had unfortunately long been identified with your ideas of the doctrine and discipline of the

Anglican Church. I will, to avoid the unpleasant alternative of a worse imputation, take it for granted that the absurdities and inconsistencies of certain classes of Protestants really were among the *bonâ fide* reasons which induced you to secede from the Anglican Church; and accordingly will take the trouble of proving that with those absurdities and inconsistencies our Church is in no way chargeable.

For the greater convenience and clearness of discussion, I purpose noticing your misrepresentations as they relate severally to the following points: The history and position of the Anglican Church, her constitution, her doctrine, her government and discipline, her means of grace, and her spirit and practice.

First, you misrepresent the history and position of our Church. You speak of the Anglican Church as having been first planted by Augustine in the sixth century, and thence take it for granted throughout, that she never had any existence otherwise than as an offshoot from the Roman Church. Whether I am to attribute this to a wilful suppression of the truth, or to complete ignorance on your part of the origin and history of the Church, of which you for so many years have been a Minister, I know not: either supposition is extremely discreditable to you; but I am again willing to adopt the latter as the more charitable

of the two, and to assume that you have actually both entered and quitted the Ministry of that Church, without acquainting yourself with her origin and with the channels through which her Orders have been derived from the apostolic fountain.

That your representation is contrary to the truth of the case, is indeed most evident; for the establishment of a branch of the Church Catholic in this country, reaches up to the apostolic age, according to the uniform testimony of antiquity; its recognition as a branch of the Catholic Church is placed beyond a doubt, apart from all other proofs, by the attendance of British bishops at the Councils of Arles and Ariminum, about two centuries and a half before the mission of Augustine; its original independence of the Roman see, and the derivation of its Orders from the Eastern churches, is sufficiently attested by the subsequent controversies between the two portions of the Anglo-Saxon Church, whose faith and discipline were derived respectively through the British and the Roman channel. It is a notorious fact, that this primitive and truly apostolic Church, the British, had as much, if not more, share in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, as the Roman missionaries and their successors; for a length of time the two branches carried on their missionary labours among the heathen in-

vaders concurrently in different parts of the island, the British chiefly in the north, the Roman chiefly in the south; and although by the arrogance with which the Roman bishops endeavoured to force conformity in matters not essential upon their British brethren, much opposition was occasionally excited between them, yet they were in communion with each other, so much so that bishops from both parties could act together in episcopal consecration.* This state of things continued until the enactment of the Canons of Uniformity at the National Synod of Hertford,† under the sixth successor of Augustine in the see of Canterbury, seventy-five years after the first arrival of Augustine on the British shores.

From these facts it plainly appears, that the descent of the Anglican Episcopacy is traceable through two distinct channels, the British, as the more ancient, and the Roman, as the more recent, down to the close of the seventh century, when the coalition took place in consequence of which the traces of separate descent are lost. How in the face of facts such as these, any one can date the origin of the Anglican Church so late as the sixth century, and attribute it exclusively to the planting of the Roman Church by Augustine, is far more surprising, than that a person capable through ignorance, or whatever

* Beda Hist. Eccl. iii. 28. † Ibid. iv. 5.

other cause, of such palpable misrepresentation, should consider dependence upon Rome as an inherent characteristic of the Anglican Church.

In connexion with this alleged dependence of the Anglican Church on the Roman see, you hesitate not farther to assert, that the "pastoral supremacy" which the Roman Bishop claims, in his capacity as universal bishop, over the Anglican as well as over every other Church, was "admitted" by the Anglican Church "from the sixth to the sixteenth century."

I will not now enter into the whole question of the supremacy of the Roman see, as that question will come before us more fully at a subsequent stage of our discussion; but shall content myself to show, what for the purpose of my present letter is abundantly sufficient, that in this point also you have, if not wilfully, at least through ignorance, been guilty of a most flagrant misrepresentation. You will not deny, that if the Anglican Church acknowledged the supremacy of the Roman bishop, as the universal bishop, the possessor of "the one Supreme see," in the sixth century, she must have done so while Gregory the Great was the occupant of that see; and you will probably farther admit, that if there was such an acknowledgment, Gregory himself must have known something about the matter. What will you then say, if I show you from authentic docu-

ments, that the said Gregory held the notion of an universal bishop, whether applied to another or to himself, in utter abhorrence. But let Gregory speak for himself:—

"Far be from the hearts of Christian men that name of blasphemy," [the title of universal bishop,] "by which the dignity of all priests is taken away while madly arrogated to himself by one. It is true that this name was, out of regard for St. Peter, the chief of the Apostles, proffered* to the Roman pontiff by the venerable Synod of Chalcedon [451]; yet none of the pontiffs has ever assumed that name of singular distinction, nor consented to make use of that term, lest by bestowing upon one individual a title so peculiar, the universal priesthood should be deprived of their proper dignity."—*Greg. Ep.* iv. 32, *ad Mauricium Aug.*

"As your holinesses are aware, this title of Universality was proffered by the holy Synod of Chalcedon to the one pontiff of the apostolic see, which by God's Providence I fill. But none of my predecessors ever consented to make use of so profane a term; because if to one patriarch the title universal is given, the name of patriarchs is virtually taken away from the others." —*Gregor. Ep.* iv. 36, *ad Eulogium et Anastasium Episcopos.*

"I confidently assert that whoever calls himself Universal Priest, or desires to be so called, is in his pride the forerunner of Antichrist, because being puffed up,

---

* Or rather suffered to be applied to him in the public documents.—See *Concil. Chalced.* Act. iii. passim.

he esteems himself above others."—*Gregor. Ep.* vi. 30, *ad Mauricium Aug.*

"If one bishop deems himself, and is, the Universal Bishop, the end of it is, that you are no bishops."—*Gregor. Ep.* vii. 70, *ad Eusebium, Urbicum,* &c.

It would be easy to swell these extracts from the Epistles of Gregory the Great, showing that he denounced the idea of the supremacy of one universal bishop as an invention of the devil, and a note of Antichrist; and as it is not for a moment to be supposed that Augustine would, upon such a point as this, hold sentiments opposed to those of Gregory and his predecessors in the Roman see, it follows that the admission of such a claim on the part of Rome by the Anglican Church, upon which you build so strongly in the course of your Letter, is no more than a gratuitous invention; and that upon this point at least your *ad captandum* argument of "three against one and one against three," by which you endeavour to disprove the identity of the present with the ancient Anglican Church, falls altogether to the ground. Instead of "St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and Archbishop Warham" being all on one side, and Dr. Howley in helpless solitude on the other, on the contrary the first occupant of the see of Canterbury, and the prelate who now fills it, concur in denouncing as a piece of antichristian arrogance the demand of "hearty alle-

giance to the see of Rome, in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, as Divinely constituted to rule and concentrate the kingdom of Christ on earth." But there is more than this. Archbishop Becket, it is true, maintained that claim with a firmness and courage worthy of a holier cause; but your other witness against our present Metropolitan, Archbishop Warham, leaves you in the lurch on cross-examination. Whatever his private sentiments might have been, (and there seems no reason to doubt that they were favourable to the papal usurpation,) it is certain that his public archi-episcopal acts constitute a complete surrender of the Roman claim of supremacy, both in name and in substance. For Archbishop Warham, and his clergy in Convocation assembled, conferred upon Henry VIII. the title "Supreme Head" of the Anglican Church, without any reservation whatever of the Pope's alleged rights, but only with the proviso annexed "as far as is allowed by Christ's law,"* a proviso the substance of which is to this day preserved in our 37th Article; and a still more substantial surrender of the points then at issue was made by the same Archbishop and Convocation shortly after, when they pledged themselves, for the future neither to

* See *Concessio facta in Synodo provinciali per Clerum Cantuarensis provinciæ pro domino rege.*—Wilkins' Concil. vol. iii. p. 742.

hold synods, nor to enact or promulgate ecclesiastical laws, without the royal assent, and concurred in the proposal of a revision of the existing laws of the Anglican Church by a body of Commissioners composed in equal proportions of clergy and laity, at the king's sole nomination.* What then becomes of your argument of "three against one?" There are, indeed, "three against one" still; but the majority is the other way; for the claim which Becket alone maintained consistently, was—reluctantly, it may be, and pusillanimously, still it was—solemnly and officially abandoned by Warham, and is utterly renounced and abjured by Dr. Howley upon precisely the same grounds upon which Gregory the Great would have repudiated it, if Augustine had been insane enough to make it, viz. that it has its root in Satanic pride, and is a plain characteristic of Antichrist.

I trust, after this specimen of your skill and accuracy in pressing historical facts and persons into your service, I may hold myself absolved from saying any more in support of the identity of the present with the ancient Anglican Church, which you deny on the ground of the alleged consent of Metropolitans from Augustine to

* See *Instrumentum super submissione Cleri coram domino rege quoad celebrationem Conciliorum provincialium, exhibitum ab Archi-episcopo Cant.* 16 *Maii*, 1532.—Wilkins' Concil. vol. iii. p. 755.

Warham, against Dr. Howley. Whether the re-assertion on the part of the Anglican Church of that Christian freedom, which in her British original she possessed to the fullest extent, and of which Augustine,—with all his zeal for the patriarchal pre-eminence of the Roman see, and the conformity of the whole Anglican Church with the Roman customs of his time,—never thought of robbing her in the manner insinuated by you, is to be reckoned among "the disasters of the sixteenth century," as you term them, or among the most happy and signal evidences of the faithfulness of Him who promised that the gates of hell should never prevail against his Church, I am quite willing, after what I have said, to leave to the judgment of "the impartial reader."

So much for your misrepresentations of the past history of the Anglican Church; a few words will suffice to show, how completely you have misrepresented her present position. You upbraid her for "her very limited extent, and her insulated position, unrecognised by the rest of Christendom." If to spread her branches over the whole earth, to plant her daughters on the Northern main of America, and in the Western Isles, on the African shores, in the gigantic empire which in India owes allegiance to the British Crown, and among her daily increasing settlements in Australasia,—if to let her light shine, by

active diffusion of the knowledge of the Gospel, and provision made, wherever a legitimate opportunity is afforded her, for the due ministration of the means of grace, alike before the civilized and the savage nations of the earth in every quarter of the globe,—if this means to be of "limited extent," the charge you bring against her, is indeed most true; but if otherwise, if words have not lost all their meaning, your charge is most palpably untrue. And no less untrue is the other reproach you cast upon her, that she is in an insulated position, unrecognised by the rest of Christendom. What are the facts of the case? The number of dioceses included in the four provinces of the United Church of England and Ireland, is alone sufficient to confute the charge, and to ward off the evils, of isolation; but that United Church, of which the Anglican is only a portion, has her sisters and daughters, with whom she is in avowed communion; the Church of Scotland, the Church of republican America, the Churches of the North American, East Indian, West Indian, and Australian dependencies of the British Crown: that United Church is moreover acknowledged by all the Churches of the East, none of whom have ever pronounced the claim of the Anglican Church to be a branch of the Church Catholic, invalid; on the contrary, the few opportunities of intercourse which, among

many hindrances to a nearer approach, have presented themselves from time to time, have served at least to place their mutual recognition as branches of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church beyond a doubt: the United Church of England and Ireland is moreover acknowledged by no inconsiderable portion of the Western Churches, by all those who, having formerly been in communion with Rome, have voluntarily or by compulsion withdrawn from that communion, under circumstances less favourable, and with less wisdom and moderation, than attended the separation of the Anglican Church; nay, she is even acknowledged by some of those who continue in the Roman communion, and as such hold her guilty of error and schism, but who have candidly owned, that to her continuity as a Church, and to the validity of her Orders no well-founded objection can be made. The only portions of Christendom by whom the Anglican Church is not recognised as a branch of the Church Catholic, (whether involved in error and schism, or no, is not now the question,) are the most violent of the heretics and schismatics who have broken away from her communion, and the clerical emissaries schismatically intruded into her dioceses by the Roman see for the purpose of disturbing her peace. Such is the position which the Anglican Church occupies, a position in many respects far

more commanding than that of the Roman Church herself; and yet, you who cannot possibly be ignorant of that position, hesitate not to set down with a pen professedly guided by truth and charity, the preposterous sentence, that "*facts*" (!!) are against the Anglican Church, "declaring her very limited extent, and her insulated position unrecognised by the rest of Christendom"! Has language lost its meaning, or shame its blush?—Nay, but, says the Roman Church in reply, or you say it for her, "the city of God is but one," and "you are too separate"! Too separate! and that to the Anglican Church, from a Church who is as much separate from the Anglican Church as the Anglican Church is from her, and not less, but more, separate from the great mass of Christendom than the Anglican; with this only difference, that in all cases where communion between herself and any other branch of the Church Catholic is suspended or obstructed, the Anglican Church can prove that the fault rests not with her; whereas in every such case it can be proved against the Roman Church, that whatever faults there may be on the other side, the main fault lies with the Roman Church herself. To her and the churches in exclusive communion with her, it may indeed, and with great truth, be said, "You are too separate" to be, what you assume to be, not a part only, but the whole, of "the city of God."

From these misrepresentations of the history and position of the Anglican Church, the misrepresentation of her Constitution which runs through your Letter, is but a natural consequence. You represent her as by constitution uncatholic,—not a church, but "a sect." This fundamental defect of her constitution you ascribe to her rejection of that "supreme earthly Head" of what you term the Catholic Church, and the consequent absence in her of a "centre of Unity." And as a proof that such is her unhappy condition, you add that she "totally fails to prove her claim, if indeed she makes that claim, to be in the world what the Jewish Church was in the Holy Land."

The leading error in your mind evidently is the twofold assumption that the Catholic Church of Christ upon earth is to have one supreme earthly Head as its visible centre of Unity, and that the Roman Bishop is that visible Head. To that assumption I shall have to advert more fully in the sequel; for the present it will suffice to point out to you that the spiritual presence of Christ, promised to his Church, as an abiding presence, "even unto the end of the world," is, though invisible, yet not on that account less real; and that consequently a Church who through faith in that promise looks to the invisible, but real and abiding, presence of Christ within her, as her centre of Unity, and who seeks to obtain for herself

the fulfilment of that promise in humble obedience through the means which were appointed for that purpose by Christ and his Apostles, has no reason to fear that she shall be "cast forth as a branch and withered," but on the contrary has the strongest possible warrant to believe that she shall continue to abide in Him on whose word she relies, and whose commands she obeys, and that He will continue to abide in her.

So long as these continue to be the principles of a Church, it is difficult to understand how any man can presume to say, that she is by constitution uncatholic, not a Church, but a sect: and upon this ground I challenge you to show that the Anglican Church, in any part of her system, has lost sight of Christ the Head, and of the promise of His abiding presence with her; I challenge you to name any of the means appointed by Christ and his Apostles for claiming that promise, and seeking communion with the Head, which is neglected by our Church, either in the edification of her private Members, or in the ordination of her public Ministers. But you are not satisfied to brand the Anglican Church as a sect; you might do this, and attribute her fall, in affectionate sorrow, to error and blindness. So far, however, are you from this course, the most becoming undoubtedly for one who has become wiser than the mother who nurtured and taught him, that, on the

contrary, you impute to her wilful, and withal hypocritical, "contempt of that order and rule which God himself has sanctioned;" you shut your eyes to all her catholic principles and institutions, and under shelter of the equivocal term "the fundamental principle of Protestantism," you charge her with "setting at defiance the testimony of nature, reason, fact, antiquity and Scripture," not through mistake,—no, you charitably "fear, because that combined testimony forbids the anarchy and self-will on which its results are based." You affect to talk as if the Anglican Church defined the Church Catholic to be "a patchwork combination of a multitude of sects;" you assert by implication that she maintains "so unscriptural, so preposterous, so untenable a position, simply for the sake of consistency, that Protestants may not seem to allow their own foundations to be overthrown;" for fear, lest she should be constrained to "return whence she came, and whither she does not choose to return;" and you seek to connect her with that "unholy licence and infidelity," which you think, and not without reason, are in our day, "mustering their forces for some great battle."

It would be waste of time to adduce the numerous proofs which the Book of Common Prayer contains on every page, that these assertions and insinuations are utterly destitute of foundation;

for while the whole range of her services is a continual attempt to lay hold upon Christ the Head, in living and spiritual presence, through the means appointed for that purpose, her abhorrence for licentious sectarianism, for schism and unbelief is evidenced not only by the entire system upon which she acts, and the instructions she imparts to her people respecting it, but more especially in that way which is assuredly the most truly catholic, and the most acceptable in the sight of God, by praying to be herself delivered from those sins, and by making intercession for the recovery of those who have fallen into them.

You cannot surely for so many years have read our beautiful services, even if you had done so in the most thoughtless manner, without having your attention directed to many portions of them, the recollection of which must witness to your own mind most forcibly the truth of what I have now stated, and must fill you, I would fain hope, with compunction for having indulged in misrepresentations so scandalous, and that with such reckless haste and anxiety to cast blame upon our Church, that you have turned even her very praise into a cause of censure. It is one of your accusations against the Anglican Church, that she has not proved, if ever she made, her "claim to be in the world what the Jewish Church was in the Holy Land." That she does not make

that claim as regards the whole world, is far from a reproach to her; for it is not meet that any member should say, as the Roman Church does, "I am the body;" but she does make the claim, and proves it too by word and deed, within the limits of the station which God has assigned to her. You cannot be ignorant of the fact, that against all classes of schismatics, the Romish intruders into her dioceses not excepted, our Church distinctly asserts her claim to be, and to be exclusively within the land in which she dwells, God's holy Church; neither can you be ignorant that she recognises most fully, in theory and in practice, the obligation, not only to seek out at home Christ's sheep who are dispersed abroad in this naughty world, but to let her light shine, and to cause the sound of her voice to be heard, throughout all the earth.

Connected with this unwarrantable misrepresentation of our Church, as if by her very constitution she were a sect, and an abettor of sects, are your misrepresentations of her doctrine. As I shall have another opportunity of contrasting the Anglican with the Roman doctrine, I will here confine my remarks to the extreme unfairness of classing the Anglican Church with the confused multitude of Protestants, among whom there is "no agreement as to those truths, of which themselves affirm it necessary to agree in belief,

in order to constitute membership in the Church of God." Is it possible for you to be ignorant that our Church requires assent to those truths, authoritatively declared by her, in common with the Church Catholic in all ages, as terms of Communion, before she ministers the sacrament of Baptism? that she has provided a Catechism for the further instruction of the persons baptized? that she requires the persons so baptized and instructed to declare their faith openly in the face of the Church, before she ministers to them the rite of Confirmation, and admits them to the Holy Communion of Christ's body and blood? that she requires of her Ministers, under the most solemn sanctions by which it is possible to bind men's consciences, assent *ex animo* to a body of Articles, in which she not only sets forth the truths she believes, and the errors she rejects, but points out the Holy Scriptures as the only fountain and standard of belief, and distinctly asserts her own authority in controversies of faith? And you, who have subscribed to these articles, and pledged yourself to bring the whole system of authoritative instruction contained in her Service-book, to bear upon her people, are bold enough to represent the Anglican Church as "driving," along with other Protestant sects, "here and there on the restless waves of private

opinion and individual interpretation of Scripture!"

A similar charge you insinuate against the government and discipline of the Anglican Church, by assigning among your "reasons" for leaving her Communion, the "absence of proof that Christ either instituted or sanctioned different forms of government and modes of worship, and a variety of discipline." Now it must be well known to you that the Anglican Church most distinctly professes to conform in her government and discipline to the Apostolic rule; and among all the vague intimations of her deficiency in this respect I cannot find any one thing specified by you, which can be shown from Scripture to have been ordained by Christ or his Apostles, and which is wanting in the system of the Anglican Church. Your only tangible ground of objection to her on this head, is her rejection of the government and discipline of the Roman Church. This rejection, however, is, as you must again be perfectly aware, founded upon a principle so well expressed by yourself, that I cannot do better than transcribe your own words,—the principle, namely, that "every deviation from that government or form of his Church which Christ gave it, and from that discipline and worship which He personally or

by his Apostles approved, is *a most presumptuous innovation, and a daring disregard of the Divine will, and fraught with danger to the souls of men.*" You will hardly venture to plead ignorance of the fact, that it was precisely upon this ground, that three centuries ago the Anglican Church cleansed her sanctuary of those "presumptuous innovations" which the Roman Church had gradually succeeded in introducing more or less in all the Western Churches, being justly alarmed at the "serious danger to the souls of men" with which those innovations are fraught, and dreading to persevere in the "daring disregard of the Divine will" which they involve. With this fact before your eyes, it was evidently your duty to have shown, that among those parts of the government and discipline of the Roman Church, which the Anglican Church rejected at the Reformation, there were some at least which Christ, by himself or his Apostles, had instituted, and which consequently no Church can have a right to depart from. But there is not, in your Letter, the slightest attempt to do this; and consequently your implied denial that the Church of Rome has been guilty of innovation, must be classed among the untenable assumptions concerning that Church, which in the third part of my argument it will be my business to disprove: while the charge of innovation which you prefer

against the Anglican Church, must, for the same reason, be reckoned among the unsupported misrepresentations, which it is my present business to expose.

In my endeavour to do this, I am, *pro hac vice*, under an obligation to you for the assistance I derive from your own admissions. For while you lay it down, that "Christ himself undoubtedly gave his Church a government, a ministry, and at least two holy ordinances of a peculiar character; constituting her an holy kingdom, in the midst of the world, yet separated from it by distinctive truths, laws, worship, and institutions; establishing her as his body on earth,"—you acknowledge that "if the Anglican Church is to be heard, there is, under the New Testament, an ordained ministry, two sacraments, and a corporate character of the Church." If this be so, if the Anglican Church answers in these essential particulars to Christ's holy institution, how came you to secede from her, and to assign as a reason for so doing the incompatibility with ecclesiastical history, of "the supposition that in the primitive Church existed various differing denominations, some having sacraments, some none; some governed by bishops, some rejecting episcopacy; some having a form of worship, some abhorring it; some baptizing infants, and some refusing to baptize them;"—a supposition to which the An-

glican Church does not give the slightest countenance, either by her doctrine or by her example, to which, on the contrary, her whole system is uniformly opposed, and which, therefore, no one reasoning with the smallest degree of fairness or correctness would ever dream of adducing, in the strange way in which you adduce it, as a reason for seceding from her Communion.

You will, I am sure, not deny that the Anglican Church recognises no other government than that of Bishops, no other ministration than that of Episcopally ordained Presbyters and Deacons. Her Articles and Ordination Service are decisive on that point; and she is enabled historically to establish the spiritual descent of her bishops from the first holders of that commission upon which the stewardship of the mysteries of grace is founded.

In the exercise of that stewardship she presents to men the two Sacraments ordained by Christ himself, as generally necessary to salvation; not merely as "badges or tokens of Christian men's profession," but as "certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, by the which God doth work invisibly in us;" and she declares the "inward and spiritual grace," or the substance of the sacrament, to be, in Baptism, "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness," and in the Lord's Supper "the body and blood

of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken by the faithful" in that sacrament.

In the exercise of that stewardship she interposes between the introduction into the Church by baptism, and the full enjoyment of personal communion with Christ in the other sacrament, a solemn invocation of the manifold gifts of the Holy Ghost upon those who have previously been "regenerated by water and by the Holy Ghost," with prayer and imposition of hands after the example of the Apostles.

In the exercise of that stewardship she exhorts men to repentance, and pronounces to them, in Christ's name, not unconditionally, but upon condition of their bringing forth fruits meet for repentance, the absolution and remission of their sins; she teaches them in her morning and evening Service both to make prayer and supplication without ceasing for all sorts and conditions of men, and to render unto God, through Christ, a daily sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, in which she unites her voice with the voice of the Church triumphant in heaven, and with the voice of the Church militant throughout all the world; and to the end that all these things may be done "unto edifying," she causes the warrant of all her ministrations, God's holy word, to be diligently read in the public congregation "in a tongue understanded of the people," and ex-

pounded to them by a Ministry enabled for that purpose by the gift of the Holy Ghost, which is in them "by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."

No cavil can ever get rid of the broad fact, that this is a most complete provision for the ministration of the means of grace committed to the stewardship of the Church Catholic, and that consequently to represent the Anglican Church as defective in this particular, is a gross misrepresentation. It will not avail you to say, that this is only the theory of the Anglican Church, and that her practice falls short of it. For, in the first place, this is a consequence necessarily attendant upon the imperfect state of a Church militant on earth in much infirmity; every Church who sets her standard as high as she ought to set it, must have to lament her inability to reach that standard; this is her humiliation, laid upon her in the order of God's counsel, as one of the trials of her faith. In the second place, the imperfections under which in practice the Anglican Church labours, are not of so essential a character, as to impair either the effectual power of her ministrations to the faithful, or the force of the witness she bears before an ungodly world. In the third place the Anglican Church does not blind herself to the fact, that the godly discipline of the Primitive Church has in some

respects lost its strictness and efficiency, but she candidly confesses that fact, and expresses a wish that it might be again restored in all its vigour; a wish which does not lie dead upon the pages of her prayer-book, but lives ardently in the hearts of many of her Ministers, who long for the opportunity of a public remedy, and until that shall arrive, are earnestly labouring to supply the defect by their private endeavours. In the fourth place, the Roman Church, or any one speaking in her name, is the very last that should venture to cast in her teeth such deficiencies as the Anglican Church does labour under; for it is by a reaction against the corruptions introduced by Rome, and the fearful abuse which she has made of that spiritual power which is given to the Church by Christ "to edification and not to destruction," that the godly discipline of the primitive Church has been impaired; it is because of the offence created by the tyranny of Rome, who by constraint lords it over God's heritage, that the bishops of other Churches, especially such as formerly were for a time partakers of her sins, find it so difficult to exercise an efficient oversight over the flock of God. Lastly, whatever may be the amount of the deficiencies, practically existing in the Anglican Church, considering that they are not attributable to any defect in her constitution, that they are not irremediable, and that

her voluntary confession of them is an earnest of their being remedied whenever practicable, such deficiencies, so far from constituting any just reason for any of her Ministers to desert his post, are on the contrary a most cogent reason for his devoting himself to her service with all his soul and with all his strength, if peradventure he may by God's help be made instrumental in remedying them; least of all ought they to be laid hold of, by one who has renounced the duty which by virtue of a solemn vow he owed her, for the purpose of palliating his unfaithfulness, by grounding on small defects of detail the misrepresentation, that her government and discipline, and her ministration of the means of grace, are essentially deficient.

There remains one point, and one only to be noticed, before I draw the present Letter to a conclusion. You are not content to vilify the Anglican Church by every possible misrepresentation, in order to make out a plausible plea for your secession from her; you deem it expedient for the same purpose, by a variety of insinuations, to depreciate the zeal and piety, the devotedness of service, the fervour of communion with God, the life in God, for God and with God, which is the joy and crown of so many devout and holy persons within her pale. You fling forth against them, tauntingly, the term "Protestant," which

you have perverted from its legitimate meaning, by making it synonymous with "self-will, anarchy, and unholy licence," and then you more than insinuate that in the Roman Church "alone" there can be, that in the Anglican Church there are not, "those whom the infinite and rich grace of God has led to desire the knowledge of and communion with Him as their chief and only satisfying joy; who wish, but scarcely dare say, they aim to live to and for Him alone: to whom He has presented himself as the admirable and most excellent object of their affections; who seek to be holocausts to his glory, in his daily service; to keep their souls like altars, whereon the fire of devotion goes not out; their bodies like temples, from which the presence of the Spirit departs not; to be able to say with truth, To us, to live is Christ, and to die gain."

This is obviously not a question for argument; that day only, in which the thoughts of all hearts shall be revealed, can lay open the grievousness of this misrepresentation. Meanwhile allow me to assist your thoughts by a hint on the cause which probably has led you to make statements so little consonant with the principles of truth and charity by which your pen professes to be guided.

There is a passage towards the end of your Letter, which no one who has ever enjoyed real personal communion with God in Christ by the

Holy Ghost, can read without a sense of holy horror, and of deep compassion for the writer. You say that "*you sought in vain to satisfy the longings of your soul* by any *combination* of Catholic forms with Protestant doctrines,—of *Catholic devotion in private* with the *Anglican public worship.*"

What an insight does this confession open into the state of your soul, and your notions of communion with the Father of Spirits! What a frightful correspondence does it present between the inconsistency of your entrance into Anglo-Catholic Orders, with a secret preference for the Roman Communion, and the inconsistency, at the close of your erratic course, of ministering in public as in the sight of God upon one principle, and the next hour addressing yourself to the same God in private upon a principle which by your own showing is diametrically opposed to the former! Is it possible that one and the same man can now address himself to the Searcher of hearts, through the only merit and mediation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and the very next hour seek His favour by the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, the modern "Queen of heaven"?!

Have you never read this Scripture: "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not;

and it shall be given him. But let him ask *in faith, nothing wavering*. For he that wavereth, is like a wave of the sea, driven with the wind and tossed. For *let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord.* A double-minded man is unstable in all his ways." That you may be enabled to see the true cause of the instability of your way, and that through the grace of repentance to the acknowledging of the truth, you may yet recover yourself out of the snare of the devil, is the fervent prayer of

Your faithful brother in the Lord,

G. E. B.

Coombe Wood,
January 21, 1842.

Maurice and Co., Printers, Fenchurch Street

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

1 Vol. 8vo. Price 14s.,

THE STANDARD OF CATHOLICITY,

Or an Attempt to point out in a plain Manner certain safe and leading Principles, amidst the conflicting Opinions by which the Church is at present agitated.

Price 1s.

OUR DAY OF SIFTING:

A plain SERMON for these perplexing Times, preached on New Year's Day, 1842, at St. Andrew's Church, Ham.

Also, Price 1s.,

THE LORD'S HOUSE:

A SERMON, preached on Sunday Evening, October 24th, 1841, at the *Chapel of Ease, Robinhood Hamlet*, in aid of the Funds now collecting for the Endowment of the said Chapel.

Published by Request, in aid of the Endowment Fund.

Also, Price 1s. 6d.,

THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

RECOMMENDED TO THE YOUNG,

IN A LETTER ADDRESSED TO HIS PUPILS.

And, Price 1s. 6d.,

GOD'S HOLY PRESENCE:

A LETTER ADDRESSED TO HIS PUPILS.

CATHOLICITY v. SIBTHORP;

OR,

SOME HELP TO ANSWER THE QUESTION,

WHETHER

THE REV. R. W. SIBTHORP, B.D.

IS NOW OR EVER WAS

A CATHOLIC?

IN A SERIES OF LETTERS ADDRESSED TO HIM

BY

THE REV. G. E. BIBER, LL.D.

Presbyter of the Anglo-Catholic Church.

Letter the Second.

LONDON:

F. C. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD; AND

WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;

AND JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

1842.

LONDON:
Printed by Maurice and Co., Fenchurch Street.

TO

THE REV. R. W. SIBTHORP.

Sir,

In my last Letter I have, I trust, adduced abundant proof of the proposition which it was my first duty to establish, viz. that you never were a sound member of the Anglican Church from which you have seceded, and whose Catholic character your misrepresentations prove you to have been incapable of apprehending: I now proceed to the second of the propositions which make up my argument in defence of the Anglican Church against your attack upon her, the proposition, namely, that *you have not any correct conceptions of the Church of Christ, and consequently nothing to guide you in your search after the true Church.* In establishing this proposition, I shall have to expose the *fallacies* respecting the Church of Christ, which your Letter contains, and to set forth, in opposition to them, the true character of that Church; but before I

do so, it will again be necessary that I should fall back upon certain indications of your own state of mind, furnished incidentally by your Letter, which will account for the otherwise strange fact, that such fallacies should not only have gained ground in a mind professedly engaged in the pursuit of truth, but that they should have exercised over that mind an ascendancy sufficient to induce the extraordinary step which you have lately taken.

According to your own statement, that which first influenced your mind towards secession from the Anglican, and junction with the Roman Church, was a certain, fancied or real, coincidence of the Roman Church with what you suppose to be the proper antitype of the typical dispensation of the Old Testament; and among the various considerations which led to your final resolve, *a* principal one, as you say, or, as it appears to me after a careful perusal of your Letter, *the* principal one, was "the communion of the whole Catholic Church, in recognition of one Supreme See and its possessor," which you think exists in the Roman communion, and which you take to be "one of her chief points of correspondency with the Jewish type."

I do not for a moment doubt the correctness of this your own exposition of the errors, in which you are entangled; but as my object is, not

merely to confute your errors, but to trace those errors,—for your benefit, if by God's blessing you might be reclaimed, and at all events by way of caution to others,—back to their original cause in your mind, I must be permitted to examine, in the first place, that spiritual vision through which the things of the kingdom of God have been reflected upon your soul in so distorted an outline, and in colours so false.

In this endeavour I am most materially assisted, as I was in a similar case in my last Letter, by your own statements. It is impossible to read through your Letter without being struck with the apparent absence in your mind of all apprehension of spiritual realities. As if you had been a perfect stranger all your life to the fact, that the Church of Christ in this present dispensation "walks by *faith*, not by *sight*,"* faith being "*the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen*;"† you ask, in reference to every expectation which your knowledge of God's truth has led you to entertain, "Where *on earth* can I *see* this?" It seems never to occur to you that the "good things to come," of which the Old Testament dispensation had only the shadows, might in their perfection and fulness be even yet future, the objects of that "patient hope,"‡ which is one of the fundamental characteristics of the Christian

* 2 Cor. v. 7. † Heb. xi. 1. ‡ Rom. viii. 20—25.

state. Neither do you seem at all to understand that while the perfection and fulness of the "good things to come" is yet future, contingent upon the consummation of all things, there are in our present condition substantial realities of life, of privilege, of enjoyment, which it is the very character of the present dispensation to present to us never otherwise than under a veil, never so that they can be seen with the eye, heard with the ear, or touched with the hand; which on the contrary are revealed and imparted to us in an invisible, spiritual, secret manner in the inmost sanctuary of our souls. The life of faith, and the perception of faith, seem to be equally unknown to you; nothing recognised as a reality, but that which can be laid hold upon in visible exhibition.

This general impression, which your whole Letter must leave upon the mind of every attentive reader, is singularly confirmed by a passage in which you have, inadvertently, almost given us a definition of the sense you attach to such terms as "real, spiritual," and the like. In that passage you say, speaking of the visible presence of Jehovah in the tabernacle and temple of old, that "there was *a real, and not merely spiritual, figurative, or imaginary* presence of God in his earthly temple." If I had met with this passage in some writing, the general tenour of which tended to show that the author acknowledged a reality in

things spiritual, I should have passed it over as proceeding from mere inadvertence in the choice of terms; but in connexion with the blindness to spiritual realities which pervades the whole of your publication, it arrested my attention as giving a clear insight into the nature of your conceptions, and the source of the errors into which you have fallen.

That which is *spiritual*, is in your view *not real*, but only *figurative or imaginary*; and *vice versâ*, that which is *real*, cannot be, to your apprehension, *invisible*, *spiritual*, it must be, in some way or other, *visible*, *material*. This is the key to all the fallacies propounded in strange confusion throughout your Letter: whether you view the Church of Christ historically, or endeavour to ascertain the theory of her constitution from the analogy of earthly kingdoms; whether you trace her shadow cast before in the types of the Old Testament, or seek to identify her in the reality of her present existence; whether you speak of her head, or of her members,—in every view which you take of that Church of which you were in search, and which you ween to have discovered in the Roman communion, the reader is every where confronted by this fundamental axiom, as it might be termed, of your theology, that that which is *real* is *not spiritual*, and that which is *spiritual* is *not real*. In other words, the basis on

which all your convictions and expectations rest, is *a visible*, and therefore in the present stage of God's purpose *an earthly*, not, as it ought to be, *an invisible*, *an heavenly* basis; you seek to apprehend every thing *by sight*, you are incapable of apprehending any thing *by faith*.

This vicious state of mental perception of things divine which characterizes your train of thought as developed in your Letter, is by no means a new thing under the sun. It is as old as God's Church on earth, and has in all ages of that Church operated, though in different ways under different circumstances, to blind a large portion of those who were ostensibly and outwardly connected with God's work and purpose among men, against the inward realities of that work and purpose. The possession or non-possession of the heaven-born gift of faith, the spiritual vision of the inner man, has in all ages of God's Church been the distinguishing feature between the real and the nominal participators of God's present grace, and of the future inheritance of his heavenly promises; and as long as the world endures, it will ever continue to be so. The most striking as well as the most awful instance of the spiritual blindness in question, is presented to us in the case of that very Church of the Old Testament, from whose example you have contrived to draw, by a false reasoning of analogy, such wrong-

headed conclusions. Had you looked at that Church in the light in which she is presented to us by Christ and his Apostles, in the verity of her history, instead of contemplating her in that false light in which the Roman Church exhibits her in support of her untenable theory of the New Testament Church, you would have found enough in the Jewish example to deter you from a carnal impatience to realize the promises of God by sight upon earth; you would have been content to walk in the footsteps of the faith of Abraham, the father of the faithful, and so to travel onward as a pilgrim and a stranger upon earth towards that heavenly country which is the final rest of the people of God, and towards that city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.

Let us pause for a moment to consider the effect of faith, or spiritual perception, on the one hand, and the effect of unbelief, or spiritual blindness, on the other hand, in the case of God's ancient people. We shall not lose, but gain, time by so doing, as it will assist us greatly in testing the correctness of your views of the Christian Church.

The Jewish people had been chosen by God, that they should be unto him "a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation;"* the kingdom of

* Exod. xix. 6.

God was theirs,* both as a present inheritance and as a future promise. It was established among them in the outward form and fashion of the Mosaic theocracy with all its attendant ordinances, ceremonies, and appointments; but this visible system, "the law," was no more than the outer shell, within which was contained the precious kernel of the invisible inheritance, the spiritual substance of the kingdom, fellowship with God in Christ. The former might be apprehended, and was apprehended, by all, however differently they might estimate its value; the latter was altogether hidden from all except those endowed with the spiritual vision of faith. Those so endowed never rested at any time in their outward and earthly connexion with God's kingdom; they ever looked by faith to Christ, and to their spiritual and heavenly inheritance in God's kingdom, through Christ, and in Christ. On the contrary those not so endowed, saw nothing, and sought for nothing, but that which might visibly be realized on earth; their descent from Abraham was the foundation of their connexion with the kingdom of God.

These two diametrically opposite tendencies of the Jewish mind, exhibited respectively in the bulk of the nation, and in the "remnant according to the election of grace," bore fruit each after

* Matt. xxi. 43.

its kind throughout the whole course of that people's history; but at no time more so, than when Christ, the end of all God's promises to them, appeared in the midst of them, in the verity of brotherhood with them, as born of the seed of David, under the law, and in the reality of personal presence, God manifest in the flesh.

At that great crisis in the history of the Jewish people, the opposite effects of a perception by faith, and a perception by sight of things divine, were most clearly apparent. Those who walked by faith, staggered not at the promise of God, even though the visible shadows which had foreshown the coming substance, were fast fading away before their eyes; for they were enabled, under "the form of a servant," to recognise the "King of Glory," the rightful heir of the "kingdom of the Saints." But those who walked by sight, and not by faith, while on the one hand they longed in carnal impatience to realize the kingdom of God on Sion's holy hill in an earthly sense, were unable, on the other hand, to discern the presence of their King, though he was in the midst of them. Thus did the absence of the spiritual vision of faith produce in the Jewish nation the twofold effect, first, of inducing a vain attempt to realize visibly upon earth now, that which in God's purpose was reserved to a future and heavenly state of things, and, secondly, of incapaci-

tating the mind for the apprehension of that present reality which was actually vouchsafed upon earth at that stage of God's purpose.

It will not be difficult to make the application of this most instructive and most awful example, to the Christian Church, and to the different views respectively taken of her by those who are, and those who are not, endowed with the spiritual vision of faith. Those who are endowed with that vision, may be expected to remain unshaken in their dependance upon God's promise, even though in the outward condition of Christ's Church upon earth difficulties and perplexities should be multiplied, because apprehending all along that "heavenly treasure," which is at present contained in the Church, as in an "earthen vessel." Those, on the contrary, who possess not the spiritual vision of faith, who walk by sight, will be seen striving to realize the Christian Church in an earthly sense, and at the same time unable to apprehend the spiritual realities, which even now are to be found within her, and in fact constitute her very existence as the Church of Christ upon earth.

It matters not whether these blind attempts to give existence and reality in a carnal and earthly sense, to that which is of its very essence spiritual and heavenly, be made in the form of Papal despotism or of Presbyterian democracy, by ecclesias-

tical constraint or by sectarian violence: the error and the sin are the same; there is in either case a forcible perversion of God's design, through an ignorant zeal to carry out that design, and a stubborn rejection of God's work, through blindness to the real character of that work. To the Roman Church belongs the bad pre-eminence of having taken the lead in carnalizing Christ's kingdom upon earth; of having done so on the most extensive scale, in the most consistent manner, and for the longest period of time: and it is not surprising therefore, that to a mind like yours, to which *spiritual* and *real* are antithetical, *spiritual* and *imaginary* convertible terms, that Church should present herself as "the close and perfect antitype of the Church under the Old Testament," as "the true Israel of God," as "the sole authorized claimant of God's favour and heritage."

How little title the Roman Church has to be considered in that light, will more fully appear in my next Letter, when I shall show that the Roman Church is far from being what you assume her to be: for the present, my concern is to show that your ideal conception of the Church of Christ, which has led you to unite yourself to the Roman Church as its correspondent reality, is itself founded in error.

In order to ascertain what the Church of Christ now existing upon earth ought to be, two

methods may be taken. We may either turn our eyes back upon the earliest beginnings of her existence upon earth; and examining her shadowy outlines, exhibited in the Old Testament dispensation, we may endeavour to fill up those outlines in fuller detail, and to clothe with substance the shadows of which they are composed; or we may cast our eyes forward to the final consummation of God's purpose of glory with her and in her, to the time when she shall descend from God out of heaven, upon the new earth, in the perfection of beauty and of holiness; and tracing out, as far as our feeble sight will permit us to dwell upon an object of such dazzling brightness, the glorious features of her perfect state, we may endeavour to ascertain wherein consists the earnest of that future glory, the life indwelling from which that glory radiates; what are the means of planting and sustaining that life in sinful humanity; and by what signs the reality of its presence may be discerned, even through the vail of the earthly tabernacle which is its present habitation. These two methods of viewing Christ's Church upon earth would obviously suggest themselves, the former to a mind whose perception is sight, the latter to one whose perception is faith. You have of necessity taken the former; I purpose, by God's help, to adopt the latter.

I find, then, on contemplating "the bride, the Lamb's wife, the holy city, new Jerusalem," that she is a body purified from all defilement, both by the exclusion from her of all that are corrupt, unrighteous, unholy, and by the purification of her members from every stain of sin, from every taint of inherent corruption. They are all pure as Christ her head is pure, perfect as He is perfect, holy as He is holy; she is a city of Saints, all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but holy and without blemish, meet in all respects to be presented before God, as the body of Him who is her Head, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all, to the praise of His glory.*

I inquire further concerning this glorious body, the Church of God, in which it is so blessed a thing to be comprehended, and so fearful a thing to be excluded from her; and I discover that although her revelation in the perfection of beauty and holiness is an event reserved for the dispensation of the fulness of times, yet her existence is not altogether future. I am told that of old there

* Rev. xxi. 2—xxii. 15; 1 John iii. 1—3; 1 Cor. xv. 42—57; Rom. viii. 29; Phil. iii. 20, 21; Heb. xii. 22—24; Eph. i. 10—12; iv. 12, 13; v. 25—27; John xvii. 22—24.

have been, that still there must be, those who actually "are come unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem;" and on closer examination I find that the continued existence of this whole world which I see around me, has no other end or purpose but to serve as a stage for the building up, through successive generations, of that heavenly city; individuals being separated from the world, though outwardly they remain in it; freed from its defilement and their own inborn corruption by the cleansing blood of the Eternal Lamb; progressively transformed by inward regeneration into the image of the heavenly Adam; and through many trials and temptations so hewn out, moulded, and fashioned, as to fit them for their appointed places, as lively stones, in God's spiritual building.*

I next endeavour to ascertain what is that power by which such mighty changes are produced in the hearts of men; and I am assured by the unfailing word of truth, that the whole is the work of the Holy Spirit of God, who carries home to the sinner's heart a sense of his native corruption, of his accumulated guilt, of his consequent

* Eph. i. 10; Rom. viii. 23—25; Heb. xii. 22; 2 Pet. iii. 9; John xi. 52; xvii. 14—16; 20—23; 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10; Tit. ii. 11—14; 1 John i. 6—ii. 2; Heb. ix. 11—15; Rom. vi. 2—11; Eph. iv. 20—24; Col. iii. 9, 10; 1 Pet. i. 3—9; iv. 12—14; ii. 4, 5.

condemnation; who exhibits to the sinner, not only the infinite justice and holiness of God, which calls for eternal vengeance against sin, but also His infinite love and mercy, which has provided an eternal sacrifice for sin in the person of his own Son, manifest in the flesh, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world; who enables the sinner both to repent of his sin for which that sacrifice was made, and to believe in the sacrifice by which his sin was done away; who, having thus reconciled the sinner to God, and given him assurance of acceptance with God through the blood of Christ, plants in the sinner's heart a new life, divine in its origin, in its character, and in its results; makes him the child of God, transforms him into the likeness of the only begotten Son of God; thus producing in him newness of life, while he continues an inhabitant of this world, and a confident hope of life and joy everlasting in the world to come, on the ground of his personal oneness with Christ; in whom as Eternal Creator, as God incarnate, as the atoning sacrifice, as the resurrection Adam, as the ascended Mediator, the everlasting High Priest, the Sovereign Judge and Redeemer, the Eternal King of Glory, the Holy Ghost causes the justified and sanctified sinner to recognise his all in all, the Head of that glorious body, the Church, whose mysterious growth is silently proceeding

through the lapse of ages, and whose finished perfection, in the end of the world, shall fill the admiring universe with wonder at the wisdom and love of God's eternal counsel.*

Again I desire to be informed, how men are made partakers of this Holy Spirit, on whose presence and operation in the heart, the benefit of God's work of redemption to the individual appears to be dependant; whether God has made any appointment for the conveyance on his part, for the solicitation on man's part, of so precious a gift: and I find certain commands given, and certain promises attached to their obedient and faithful performance, which lead me inevitably to the conclusion, that prayer in the name of Christ, and in dependance upon God's promises through Christ, is the way appointed by God for seeking to obtain His holy Spirit; and that, besides a general promise that prayer so offered shall be accepted, a special promise is attached to two ordinances, as vehicles of the gift of life eternal through the Holy Ghost, and as means of incorporation and sustentation in that body the Church,

* John xvi. 13—15; 1 Cor. ii. 9—12; Acts v. 30—32; John xvi. 8—11; Rom. viii. 1—17; Eph. ii. 4—10; 1 Cor. vi. 11; xii. 2, 3; John iii. 5—8; Gal. iv. 6, 7; Eph. ii. 18; Tit. iii. 4—7; 1 Pet. i. 2; 1 John iii. 23, 24; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Eph. ii. 22; 1 John iv. 13; 2 Cor. i. 20—22; iv. 16—v. 8; Col. i. 27; iii. 1—4; Eph. i. 3—14.

of which, in its corporate capacity, and in the heart of each individual member, the Holy Ghost is the life.*

The further inquiry then forces itself upon me, to whom it belongs to minister those ordinances which present themselves, not only as pledges of the operation of the Holy Ghost in the heart of man, but as the very effectual means by which, according to God's appointment, that operation takes place; and I learn in reply, that Christ himself appointed certain men, to whom he gave certain commands, the execution of which is to continue until his return from heaven in the end of the world. Those commands, I find, comprehend, besides the ministration of the two ordinances in question, generally the oversight and direction of the whole body of those grafted into the Church, and the authoritative promulgation of the divine will, both to the members of that body, and to the world at large. I find, that for the execution of so weighty a trust, special gifts, and peculiar powers were committed to those men, and provision made for the transmission of those gifts and powers to the hands of others, after the

* Luke xi. 1—13; James i. 5—7; 1 John v. 14, 15; Matth. xxviii. 18—20; Mark xvi. 15, 16; John iii. 5; Acts ii. 38, 39; Tit. iii. 4—7; Eph. iv. 4—6; 1 Cor. xii. 13; John vi. 32—58; Matth. xxvi. 26—28; 1 Cor. x. 16, 17; xi. 23—29; 1 John v. 8.

departure from this world of the first depositaries of that trust.*

Thus, then, by a train of inquiry into God's purposes and appointments, of which the limits of a letter will only permit me to sketch the main outline,† I arrive at a definite idea of Christ's Church upon earth, not by a laboured and possibly fanciful attempt to fill up the shadowy outlines of the Old Testament dispensation, but by a close investigation of God's revealed will, keeping my eye constantly upon that heavenly Church, which alone is entitled, properly speaking, to the appellation of Christ's body; whose real but imperfect existence on earth I have clearly ascertained, and enabled myself to identify her in the event of different claimants presenting themselves, whose pretensions to be the whole or a part of her, might be incompatible with each other. For it follows incontrovertibly, if the premises laid

* Luke vi. 13; Matth. xvi. 15—19; xviii. 18; John xx. 21—23; Matth. xxviii. 16—20; Acts i. 7, 8, 15—26; ii. 1—39; ix. 1—19; Gal. i. 11, 12; 1 Cor. v. 3—5; 2 Cor. ii. 6—11; 1 Cor. x. 16; Acts vi. 1—6; xiii. 1—3; xiv. 23; 2 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. i. 5; Rev. ii. 1, 8, 12, 18; iii. 1, 7, 14; Acts xx. 28; Heb. xiii. 17; 1 Thess. v. 12, 13; 1 Pet. v. 1—4; 1 Tim. iii. 1—15; iv. 11—16; v. 19—22; 2 Tim. i. 6—14; iv. 1—8; Tit. ii. 15; Matth. xxii. 45; 1 Cor. iv. 1; 2 Cor. v. 18—20; Eph. iv. 7—13.

† See, for a fuller developement of the points on which the above argument is founded, "The Standard of Catholicity," ch. ii.—vi.

down be correct, that if any body of men are enabled to connect themselves with the original commission, whereby certain men and their successors were constituted stewards of the mysteries of God, and continue obedient to the appointments, for the execution of which the stewardship was first established, their claim to be considered as a portion of Christ's Church, cannot be denied. On the other hand it is equally clear, that if any pretend to be stewards, who cannot produce such a warrant for their ministrations, derived from competent authority, their claim must be rejected; and that if any of those who are duly authorized, depart from those appointments to which their commission relates, by addition, omission, or alteration, it becomes not only the right, but to the extent of their own share of the common responsibility, the duty of the other authorized stewards, to resist every such "deviation from that government or form of his Church which Christ gave it, and from that discipline and worship which He personally, or by his Apostles, approved," as "a most presumptuous innovation, and a daring disregard of the divine will, fraught with danger to the souls of men."

But it is not sufficient that a body claiming to be a part or branch of Christ's Church should be in possession of the original commission, and should adhere in outward performance to the

original appointments of Christ; there ought to be evidence, moreover, that the commission is exercised, that the means appointed are used, sincerely, devoutly, effectually, for the purpose for which they were given, that is "for the edifying of the body of Christ." That evidence we must look for in the life and character of the members and ministers of the Church: "by their fruits ye shall know them." In order, however, to "know them by their fruits," we must have a clear apprehension, in the first place, of the nature of the fruits to be expected; and this must necessarily be determined by the essential character of that purpose of God, in connexion with which alone the existence of Christ's Church on earth can be recognised. The character of that purpose is essentially heavenly, spiritual; and of the same character therefore must be the fruits of a church, in order to be true fruits. They must be fruits of the Spirit, they must have the savour of heaven. Mere activity and zeal, mere "punctuality of devotion," will not meet the high demand; it is not enough that men should be loud in the promulgation of the doctrines, or diligent in the observance of the duties, of religion; not enough even, that for the promotion of the cause of religion they should make signal exertions and great sacrifices; though we prophesy in the name of Christ, though in his name we cast out devils,

though in his name we do many wonderful works, yet it may be said to us at the last by Christ himself, "I never knew you." The most indefatigable labours in the cause of the Gospel, the most extensive sacrifices of wealth, ease, personal comfort, yea, of life itself, may be either the result of slavish fear, and a fallacious hope of establishing a righteousness of our own; or else they may be the result of an all-absorbing desire to advance an earthly system, a scheme of human devising, which has engaged our prejudices, and pressed us into its service by means of one or other of the many sinful passions which admit of being turned into powerful motives for an apparently righteous and holy course of action; they may be no more than the fruit of thorough devotion to an "interest," or an "establishment."

If, on the contrary, we can discern in a church fruits which are not, nor ever can be, of earthly growth,—holy joy and peace in believing, the fruit of the love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost; fervent charity rising above the transient associations, the changeful sympathies of earth; ardent devotion, humbly shrouding itself, under a sense of its poverty and need, in the visible ordinance and the outward form, yet soaring aloft with the bold wing of faith to the threshold of the true tabernacle, and there offering its incense of praise "with angels and arch-

angels, and with all the company of heaven;"—if the bearing of her members indicates that their conversation is in heaven, from whence they look, with the longing eye of love, for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; that the life which they live in the flesh, is not their own life, but Christ's life in them, a life of faith, a constant practical confession that they are strangers and pilgrims on the earth;—if her Ministers especially, stand upon the earth, not as the officers of an earthly establishment, but as messengers from heaven, as ambassadors of Christ;—if the meat which in due season they distribute to the household of Christ, be not the earthly bread of doctrines and ordinances, but the heavenly manna of truth and grace sent down from heaven in answer to their faithful supplications for the flock of God committed to their charge;—if their ministrations be addressed not merely to the intellect and feelings of the children of Adam, but to the hidden man of the heart, created after God in righteousness and true holiness;—if they deal with the members of their flocks not as with men of the earth, but as with citizens of heaven;—if such be the character discernible in a church, in her members and ministers,—then, and then only, can it be said with truth that she is such as "Christ left," such as on his return He "desires to find" his family on earth.

But, alas! what church on earth does answer to this heavenly pattern? Nay, we may ask further, do the prophecies of Scripture encourage us to hope, that any church will be so found at Christ's coming? Or will it be with them, as it was with the ten virgins in the parable, of whom, evidently with special reference to the state of the Christian churches upon earth at the second advent, it is said that all, the wise as well as the foolish, slumbered and slept? However that may be,—and to enter upon this question further would be foreign to my present purpose,—the different circumstances of the parable aptly illustrate the different conditions in which bodies, claiming to be parts of Christ's Church upon earth, may be found. In the case of the wise virgins, who themselves, it is true, slumbered and slept while the bridegroom tarried, and whose lamps consequently needed trimming when the midnight cry, "Behold the bridegroom cometh," broke in upon their slumbers, but who nevertheless were provided with oil, and thereby enabled to trim their lamps in the hour of need, we have set before us the case of churches, whose spiritual life has been suffered to fall into decay; the expectation of Christ's second advent having through the lapse of ages become less vivid than it was in the times of the Church's first love; men having learned to view the Church rather

as the earthly and visible corporation to which they and their forefathers, it may be, for many generations have owed allegiance, than as that heavenly and invisible community, the mystical body of Christ. Still the life of the Spirit is continuing to burn and to shine in those churches, coldly, perhaps, and dimly, yet not beyond recovery, when a call is made, sufficiently loud,—even though it should not be the bridegroom's final call,—to arouse them from their sleep. Such, I do not wish to deny it, however sorrowful may be the confession, had been the state of the Anglican Church for a long season; it is not, thanks be to God, her state at this moment; for she has awoke, and is busily employed in trimming her lamp: whether it be, that some other disturbing cause has broke in upon her slothful repose, or that her sleep being lighter, and her ear more discerning, the midnight shout of the coming bridegroom has reached her from a greater distance than her still slumbering sisters, the event alone can show.

But by the side of churches whose spiritual light has grown dim, we have exhibited to us in the parable other churches in a state still more deplorable; the churches signified by the virgins of whom it is said, that having failed to provide themselves with oil, they found their lamps going out altogether, when they attempted to trim them. Under this figure we behold those

churches who, while preserving the lamp, the externals of a church, its regular descent and its outward ordinances, have lost sight of the oil, that is, of the spiritual reality of which a legitimate Ministry and its external ministrations are only the vessel, and who consequently shall, whenever the great crisis alluded to in the parable arrives, be found in a state of irremediable deadness. In this state, it is much to be feared that the Roman Church, and possibly more than one church associated with her in that communion whose supposed catholicity has beguiled you, are already involved; so much so, that however sincerely we all must, however fervently some of us may, desire that she might return from the error of her way, and so re-open to us and to other Christian churches the door of inter-communion, the attentive student of unfulfilled prophecy will scarcely be able to indulge a hope, that such a wish can ever be realized.

There is one more case, which it is no part of the design of the parable to notice, but which nevertheless may be illustrated by a further carrying out of its figures; the case of one mixing in the company of the virgins, but unprovided with the festive lamp. Under the circumstances from which the imagery of the parable is borrowed, this would indicate that she was not really one of the bridal train, but a stranger who had

intruded herself into its ranks. The corresponding case in the outward aspect of Christendom is the case of bodies of men, who, though deficient even in the external conditions of a church, nevertheless usurp that name, and claim to take rank accordingly among the churches of the earth; of whom it will not be necessary for me here to say more, than that "them that are without, God judgeth."

I have been thus particular in enumerating and illustrating the different circumstances under which it is conceivable that a body claiming to be a church, *i. e.* a branch of the Church Catholic, may come before us, in order to lay the foundation for certain rules by which an individual is to be guided in determining the question whether he is to forsake one, or to join another communion; rules which if you had endeavoured to ascertain, and to acquaint yourself with the principles on which they are founded, you would not now be where you are.

If a man had the absolute choice given him, to which of all the different churches upon the face of the whole earth he would wish to unite himself, there can be no doubt whatever, that he would be bound to unite himself to the one which, upon careful examination, should prove to come nearest to the standard of what the Christian Church, in her whole extent, and in every one of her

branches, ought to be. But the case supposed is, obviously, in the nature of things impossible; it is not conceivable that any individual should have grown to a maturity of insight into spiritual things, sufficient to qualify him for such a choice, and yet should continue to stand personally aloof from all the churches of Christendom, not one of them having more claim upon his allegiance than another.

On the contrary, it is clear, that the position assigned to each individual in the world by the providence of God, either by his birth, or by other determining circumstances, must bring him into more or less close connexion with some body or other of professing Christians, long before he can have acquired a sufficient knowledge of the Christian covenant, and of the terms on which it is offered to men, to qualify him for choosing one and rejecting another communion. To this previously determined providential position it is very possible to attach too much, but it is possible also to attach to it, as you have done, too little weight. On every principle of sound reasoning, and in the natural order of things, that position is *primâ facie* a man's proper position, the position from which, without substantial reasons, he is not to move; simply because God has placed him there in the first instance, and therefore nothing can justify his removal from it, but a clear

conviction, formed upon sufficient data, that to remain in it would be acting in opposition to God's declared will.

Starting from this principle, the soundness of which I am sure you will not question, let us examine what a man's duty would be on finding the communion in which he is providentially placed, to be in each of the different conditions before enumerated.

Let us suppose the first case which might suggest to him the propriety of a change, the case, in fact, which through an erroneous, and I cannot help adding, somewhat uncharitable judgment passed by you upon the Anglican Church, seems to have been the original means of unsettling your mind; the case of a church in whom the spiritual life had grown cold, and the spiritual light dim, through indolence and worldly ease,—the case of the virgin provided both with a lamp and with oil, but fallen asleep. In that case, if responsibility correspondent with a privilege is not an empty sound, nothing can justify a separation from the communion in which a man finds himself placed in the order of God's providence. It has pleased God to bestow upon him, through the instrumentality of that communion, the unspeakable blessings involved in the Christian Covenant state; and a debt of gratitude and of covenant service has thereby

been incurred on his part towards God, in the discharge of which he can hardly presume to consult his own taste and fancy, but is most obviously bound to acquit himself of it through the very same channel, through which the benefit has been bestowed upon him. Nothing short of a total impossibility of discharging it through that channel, could ever justify his choosing, of his own free accord, a different one; and such an impossibility the case which we are now considering, does not, nor ever can, present. As long as the wasting lamp has some fading glimmer left, as long as oil remains in the vessels, with which the dying flame may be fed and rekindled, the duty of each individual to do his part towards so desirable a result, remains in full force; and the difficulties with which the task may be surrounded, so far from justifying a faint-hearted dereliction of that duty, on the contrary increase in a proportionate degree the weight of its obligation.

Let us next inquire what would be the duty of an individual in the case of his finding the spiritual life and light, of which the external constitution and ordinances of a church are only the vessel, completely lost sight of in the church in which God's providence had placed him,—that church resembling a virgin whose lamp is going out while she is sleeping, and who is unprovided

with oil wherewith to trim it. This is a case which presents, on the face of it, far stronger reasons for separation from a communion sunk so low beneath her high calling as a branch of the Catholic Church. Still, if an individual have, through her instrumentality, been first introduced into the Covenant of Grace,—though his insight into the spiritual realities to which it relates, should have been obtained from other sources,—it is not easy to see how he can be justified in separating from her, as soon as he is enabled to discern her perilous condition; in leaving her to her fate, with no other concern except for his own safety. It must at least be his duty to warn her; to arouse her from her sleep, to point out to her the want of oil in her vessels, and to advise her to go and buy, if peradventure there might yet be time for her to do so, before the midnight-cry of the coming bridegroom be raised: or, to drop the allegory, it would be the duty of an individual, finding himself in the order of God's providence a member of a church whose religion had become a mere dead system of external service, to lift up his voice in the midst of her; calling upon her in the language both of affectionate remonstrance and of severe rebuke, if he might peradventure persuade her, to consider her lifeless, her unsafe, her sinful condition, to repent and to bring forth fruits

meet for repentance. The superior light vouchsafed to himself by God's grace, might possibly be the means of converting her from the error of her way, and so saving, not one, but many thousand souls from death. The earnest, affectionate, prayerful endeavour to do this, must not be abandoned until there be manifested on her part the most settled determination to continue in her sin; the most obstinate refusal to lend her ear to the voice of truth and of faithful exhortation. So imperative is this duty, that it is difficult to conceive an individual leaving the communion in which God's providence originally placed him, as long as he has an option left him;—martyrdom, or excommunication pronounced against him, seem to be the only methods of satisfactory release from the duties incumbent on him by virtue of his membership. It need hardly be added, that the obligation so resting upon every member of a lifeless church, whom it had pleased God to enlighten concerning his own and her condition, must press with infinitely greater weight upon a Minister of that church, and that in proportion to the degree of authority and power attached to his station. If it should appear to you, that the rule here drawn is too stringent, I would only remind you of the example of the Apostles of our Lord, who were willing to expose themselves to excommunication and every other kind of violent perse

cution, rather than withhold the faithful testimony which they had to bear, as messengers of life, in the midst of a church hardened in dead formalism.

There is one more case left, the consideration of which is necessary to this part of my argument; the case, namely, where an individual finds himself by God's providence in a communion, which on closer examination he finds to be altogether destitute of even the external conditions of a church. In that case the decision is easy, and the course to be pursued plain; because in that case there is not in reality any body, to whom the duty of membership can be owing. The corporate character of the Church Catholic, or of any of her branches, has its origin in the ordinance of God, not in the aggregate will of the individuals who compose it; and consequently a voluntary association of individuals in the common bond of ordinances determined upon by themselves, can never possess the corporate character of a church. Still there is a duty owing on the part of the individual who has by God's grace been enabled to discern the common error; but it is a duty not to a body, which in this case has no real existence, but to the individuals who compose the imaginary body; the duty, namely, to apprize them of the fact, that they are only individuals associated in self-will, not a body ecclesiastical or spiritual; and to the full and efficient discharge

of that duty there is not a simpler nor a readier way, than to disavow all further participation in such a factitious combination, and to join without loss of time that branch of Christ's Church, possessing by God's ordinance a corporate character, which presents itself as the most legitimate refuge to the homeless wanderer.

I have thus reasoned out, through all its consequences, as far as they relate to our present argument, that view of Christ's Church, which is founded upon an apprehension, by the spiritual perception of faith, both of her final state of perfection and glory, (to which her present militant state on earth stands in the same relation as the means to the end,) and, by consequence, of those spiritual realities, which even in her present state are to be found within her, and in fact constitute her very existence as the Church of Christ upon earth. In doing so, I have purposely avoided all reference to the fallacies with which your view of Christ's Church, as set forth in your Letter, is encumbered; deeming it more conducive to clearness, first of all to lay down definitely the real facts of the case with which we have to deal, and after that to dissipate the illusions by which you are prevented from discerning those facts. To that part of our discussion I now proceed.

The first point which presents itself to my

notice, is the necessity assumed by you, of a close correspondence between the Old Testament Church, which you justly consider to have throughout a typical character, and the "Church under the New Testament," or, as you also term it, "the mystical body of Christ." This, indeed, seems to be the cardinal point upon which your whole view of Christ's Church turns; and if I shall be able to show, that herein you have built upon a fallacy, it will go far to demolish the whole edifice of the ideal Church Catholic, which you have reared in your Letter.

Before I do so, let me, amidst so much conflict of opinion, indulge the gratification of expressing my perfect concurrence in the striking remarks with which you open this part of your subject. "The types of the Mosaic economy," you justly observe, "had not their only accomplishment in the blessed Saviour, or in Christ personally. He, it is clear, was not the typified Israel; nor the Mount Zion, nor the Holy City; nor solely the temple: neither did the shew-bread, or incense, or seven-branched candlestick, or Levitical ministry, prefigure Him, or His work and office only. The types, like most of the prophecies and the Psalms, have, then, a further application than to Christ, personally or officially. But to whom or what? To his mystical body, the Church under the New Testament. None of

these interesting portions of Holy Scripture can be rightly understood without the apprehension of this truth."

Thus far, there is between us the most perfect agreement; and I do not apprehend that any sound and careful interpreter of Scripture will dissent from the view you have so expressed. Your premises are correct, yet your conclusion is fallacious; because by the "Church under the New Testament, the mystical body of Christ," you understand, as appears by your subsequent remarks, not the Church triumphant and perfect, which is in truth the antitype of the Levitical types; but the Church militant on earth, the imperfect, transient "institution designed to uphold and diffuse a system of saving truth" all over the earth; or rather, as I should have expressed it, designed to serve as the external scaffolding, within which the edifice of "the mystical body of Christ" is to be raised. Here, then, lies your first great error, the result of your looking at things divine not by faith, but by sight. And yet it seems very obvious, in opposition to the view you take, that the antitype should be permanent, not transient, in its character; obvious, that earthly things do shadow forth heavenly, not other earthly things; obvious, that the mystical body of Christ, though contained in, cannot be identical with, his visible body; ob-

vious, that if the Levitical shadows point to true Christ as the Head, they must also point to Christ's true body, which is not the mixture of good and bad, of wheat and tares, of which, in any hypothesis, Christ's Church upon earth consists, but that "glorious Church, holy and without blemish," in which at his second coming Christ shall be glorified. That there will be found in that "glorious Church" a close correspondence with all the Levitical types, far closer and more comprehensive than the utmost ingenuity could ever contrive to point out in the earthly church, I make no manner of doubt; many of the delineations of the "glorious Church" in the prophetic parts of Scripture clearly point that way; and much that now is lost in the comparison, will be distinctly traceable, when we shall no longer see "through a glass darkly," but shall behold "face to face."

To make the visible Church, as she stands upon earth, during the appointed time of her militancy, the antitype of the Old Testament Church, with all her Levitical shadows and types, is to rob the Levitical dispensation of its glory, which was, to be "a shadow of *heavenly* things,"* as is expressly affirmed by the Apostle; and to exalt the present dispensation above measure, by making it the end of the Old Testament dispen-

* Heb. viii. 5.

sation, whereas it is only a means, though of a superior, more comprehensive, and more spiritual character, yet still a means, to the same end to which the Old Testament dispensation was likewise subservient, viz. the glorious Church, which is truly the mystical body of Christ.

This view of the sense in which the Church under the New Testament is the antitype of the Old Testament Church, is by no means invalidated by the fact, that occasional analogies may be traced between the Levitical institutions and those of the Christian Church now extant upon earth. It is but natural there should be such analogies, considering that the visible Church cannot fail to bear some resemblance to the mystical body of Christ; so that some of the features of the latter, which were fore-shadowed in the Levitical dispensation, are reflected back likewise from the perfect and glorious Church, into her present state of imperfect and earthly existence. The intervention of the "glorious Church" as that to which the Old Testament Church, and Christ's visible Church now on earth, both point alike, though in different ways, is quite sufficient to account for all the particulars which in the latter two may be thought to correspond. But there is this mighty difference between analogies seen through the medium of the future Church triumphant, the true antitype, and analogies seen be-

tween the old Church and the Church now militant, as if the latter were the true and final antitype, that in the latter case the different features of the Levitical institution may be used, as you have used them, for building up a plausible, yet utterly fallacious, theory of what the visible Church of Christ on earth ought to be, whereas in the former case such a proceeding is wholly out of the question.

Having thus disposed of what might be termed the fundamental fallacy of your theory of the Church Catholic, I now turn to the other fallacies which you have drawn from it by a regular process of derivation.

The first of these is the notion, that the Church of Christ upon earth must be "characterized by visible oneness." That unity must be one of the characteristics of Christ's Church, is indeed most evident; and equally evident it is, that that unity must be discernible even in her present militant condition. The only question is, by what kind of vision that unity is to be discerned, whether by the perception of faith, or the perception of sight. If it be true, that during the whole of this dispensation we "walk by faith, and not by sight," it follows that the real unity of the Church can be discerned only by the eye of faith: but in the state of mental perception to which I have adverted at the commencement of this Letter, you

were of course unable to see a spiritual unity with the eye of faith; you were needs compelled to look out for such a unity as should be discernible, not by faith, but by sight; and consequently you have apprehended, as might be expected, not a "real," but an "imaginary," that is a carnal, unity. It may sound strange to your ears, but so it is: the visible unity of which you speak, and which you fancy to be real, is altogether imaginary; and the real unity of the Church, that which is neither "imaginary" nor "figurative," is a "spiritual" unity; though, certainly, not a spiritual unity in the sense which you attach to these words, and which affords a lamentable but striking evidence of your total incapacity to apprehend things spiritual with the eye of faith.

Your definition of "spiritual unity" is as follows: "A unity in the reception of certain doctrines distinguished as fundamental, in holiness of life, and in certain interior consolations and privileges of true piety;" and in another place you designate the idea of "spiritual unity" as "that lax and purely Protestant notion of an harmonious body made up of discordant parts; of unity in the Spirit consisting with diversity of interests actively pursued, and with exclusiveness as to Church communion; of the bond of peace being held amid exclusion from each other's altars, and loud condemnation of each other's doctrines and

worship; of ecclesiastical order without discipline, and of godly obedience without supreme government."

No wonder that you scout the idea of spiritual unity! But allow me to say, that although this may be the notion of spiritual unity propounded by sectarians, and by unsound members of our Church, possibly perhaps some time propounded by yourself, it is not,—as indeed, in connexion with the paragraph last quoted, you fairly admit,—the conception which sound members of any Catholic branch of Christ's Church have of spiritual unity.

Spiritual unity is the common apprehension of our having "come to the city of the living God, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born which are written in heaven;" it is fellowship in the communion of that one and the self-same Spirit, by whose inward operation all the imperfect portions of the great spiritual building are here upon earth through successive ages fitted for their appointed places. This spiritual unity, so far from giving countenance to mutual exclusion and condemnation of the different parts of the Church Catholic, on the contrary sets every disturbance of the bond of peace, every interruption of communion, in a most heinous light, shows it to be a most grievous sin. It is in consequence of the value he sets upon spiritual unity, and of the abhorrence he feels from every kind of schism

in that body which should be but one, that the true Catholic opposes every kind of deviation from the divinely appointed means of grace; whether such deviation consist in wilful neglect of those means, wholly or in part, or in the imposition of terms of communion not warranted by Christ's institution and by his holy Word. In the former case, the unity of the Spirit is broken by disobedience to the divine command, which, while it debars the contumacious from the communion of the Holy Spirit under the terms of the covenant, is at the same time an evidence of the absence of that communion, whose tendency always is to promote order, peace, and brotherly love. In the latter case the unity of the Spirit is destroyed, because the attention is withdrawn from that which constitutes the essence of the Christian state, personal communion with the Holy Spirit, and from the appointed means of obtaining and sustaining that communion; and the criterion of incorporation in Christ's holy Church is made to consist of outward conformity in matters, which may indeed be lawful in themselves, but which, as they cannot, by that human authority which ordains them, be made the door of admission to the kingdom of God, may not, on the contrary side, be turned into a bar of exclusion from it; and, therefore, ought not to be insisted on further than the decency and order of divine wor-

ship, and of ministration in God's name, may under different circumstances require.

The latter error is that into which the Roman Church has fallen, and by obstinately persisting in it, in utter disregard of its baneful consequences, has brought upon herself the sin of schism, and the reproach, that although by constitution a branch of the Church Catholic, she is in her character and attitude most uncatholic. Into that error you have followed her, under the influence of your blindness to that which really is, and of your erroneous notions of what you miscal, "spiritual unity." Thus we arrive, by a natural descent, at your second fallacy, that the Church Catholic must be characterized by a perfect uniformity, not only of "doctrine, discipline, and worship," but of "*ceremonial*," all "over the wide earth."

As I have already pointed out the duty of agreement, even in things outward, if divinely appointed, and the sin of insisting upon things not so appointed, in such a manner as to make them a stumbling-block in men's way, I need not farther enlarge upon these two points. It will only be necessary, for the more effectual confutation of your fallacy, to show, that there never existed, at any period of Christ's Church upon earth, such an outward conformity in the external observances of religion, as that which you require in order

to exhibit visibly, to the carnal eye, the unity of the Church Catholic, and to which you seem even to attribute the power of producing that unity, which in reality can only be produced by the inward, spiritual operation of the Holy Ghost.

Even in the days, and under the immediate government of the Apostles, no such external conformity of observances existed in the different churches which collectively made up the Catholic Church. On the contrary, there existed among them a diversity of opinion and practice, of greater magnitude, perhaps, than any that has since arisen upon points of external observance; the question, namely, whether the rite of circumcision and the law of Moses were of universal obligation in the Church Catholic. Upon the fundamental truth of justification by faith in Christ Jesus, as opposed to justification by the works of the law, there was no disagreement; those who made the works of the law the ground of salvation, were directly discountenanced as false teachers, perverters of the truth: but the case was very different with regard to the observance, as a matter of obedience to God, of the rite of circumcision, and of other Levitical institutions. That observance was by some insisted on as a condition of salvation, and by others rejected as superfluous; and the controversy rose to such a height, as to induce an appeal to the Apostolic College

at Jerusalem.* And what was the decision there come to? Did the Apostles insist upon that uniformity of discipline and ceremonial in this matter, which you represent as an indispensable feature of the Catholic Church? Did they pronounce their anathema upon those Jewish Christians who at Jerusalem and elsewhere continued to observe the customs of the Levitical law? Or did they anathematize those Gentile Christians who objected to have those customs bound upon their consciences, because a burden too heavy for them to bear? They did neither: they interfered no further by the interposition of their high authority, than to prevent the observances in question from being imposed as terms of communion by one portion of the Christian Church upon the other; and having pointed out to the advocates of the Levitical system, that "Moses had in every city them that preached him," and to the aggrieved Gentile converts, that, with certain exceptions expressly specified, they might dispense with that whole system without detriment to their faith, they left every man to act in such matters accordingly as he was "fully persuaded in his own mind."

You will observe, that the point at issue here was one of very great importance on more than one ground. In the first place the Levitical sys-

* Acts xv. 1—31.

tem was of divine institution; in the next place, the nature of that system was such, as to bring the diversity of opinion and practice on the subject continually under notice in the details of daily life; and lastly, the contention respecting it had been so great, that an adjudication which should set the question finally at rest, was most imperatively demanded for the peace of the Church: and yet, notwithstanding all these considerations, the Apostles made a decree,—in which they were not afraid expressly to declare the concurrence of the Holy Ghost in the sentence given by them,—which went no farther than to prevent a compulsory imposition of the disputed observances upon any, and left so great a latitude to national prejudice and private opinion, that if your positions in regard to perfect uniformity of discipline and ceremonial, as an indispensable condition of Catholicity, be correct, there cannot remain a shadow of doubt, that the Catholicity of the Church was surrendered by the Apostles themselves,—St. Peter being their chief counsellor, and St. James the Lord's brother, as Bishop of the Mother Church of Jerusalem, their President on the occasion,—within twenty years after the ascension of Christ, and the first foundation of the Church by the Pentecostal effusion of the Holy Ghost.

And what is thus clearly demonstrated of the

apostolic age itself, that there was then no such uniformity of "discipline and ceremonial," as you require, in the Church Catholic, is equally true of every subsequent period of the Church's existence, from that day to this. In the age immediately succeeding, the differences respecting the Lent-fast, and the time of keeping Easter, caused much discussion between the churches of the East and West; yet the Bishop of Rome of that day did not consider uniformity in this matter essential to Catholic Communion;* nor did any of his successors to the close of the second century, when Victor's uncatholic conduct in proposing to excommunicate those who differed from him in this matter, called forth the earnest remonstrances of more than one Christian bishop, Irenæus among the rest.† The same difference is mentioned, towards the middle of the fifth century, by Socrates, who after giving a long catalogue of diversities of customs, some of considerable practical importance, which obtained in different churches, adds that it would be plainly impossible to enumerate all the various customs observed in different cities and countries of Christendom. Nor does it appear from his statement, that communion was, except in some few cases, interrupted by these diversities, for which

* Iren. Ep. ad Vict. ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. v. 24.

† Euseb. l. c.

he accounts by the supposition, that the bishops of different churches having found them established in the time of their predecessors, handed them down as a rule to their successors.* The sentiments of Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, on this subject are to the same effect: "In matters of this description," he says, after adverting to a variety of customs and observances in different places, "there is no rule of discipline better suited to a serious and wise Christian, than to conform to what he sees to be the practice of the church, where he happens to be. For whatever is proved to be neither against faith, nor against good manners, is to be held indifferent, and observed for the sake of conformity with those among whom we live." † The differences which arose between the British churches and the clergy who followed the Roman customs, under Augustine and his successors, have already been noticed; and whatever might be the zeal with which Augustine especially prosecuted the scheme of enforcing strict conformity in all the churches of the island, it is certain that Gregory the Great held in regard to such matters opinions consonant with those of the Catholic Church to his time;

* Socrates Hist. Eccles. v. 22.

† Augustin. ad Inquis. Januar. i. 54; where he also relates the celebrated saying of Ambrose: *Cum Romam venio, jejuno sabbato: cum hîc sum, non jejuno.*

for in a letter to Leander, Bishop of Seville, he decides the question of preference between single and trine immersion in baptism, upon the ground of expediency from the peculiar circumstances of the case on which he had been consulted; contending at the same time for the equal admissibility of both these customs, upon this Catholic principle, with which I will conclude my argument against the alleged necessity of uniformity in discipline and ceremonial, as an indispensable characteristic of the Catholic Church,—the principle, namely, that "*In the one faith diversity of custom does not harm Holy Church.*" *

There is one more fallacy into which you are betrayed by your carnal view of Catholic unity, viz. the necessity of recognition of one Supreme See and its possessor. It is difficult indeed to see, how upon your principle you could support your view of the Church at all without this fallacy; for, as you justly observe, the differences, not of discipline and of ceremonial only, but of doctrine and worship, between the Roman Church and other branches of the Church Catholic, especially the Anglican, are so great and so vital, that "the one or the other must change, to preserve the proper unity of the whole." From this admission it would not be unfair to draw the conclusion, that he who makes it, perceives the

* Gregor. Epist. i. 41.

necessity of examining closely into those differences, and advising that party to make the change, who, upon such examination made, shall prove to be in the wrong. Yet, though you thus tread, as it were, upon the very line which divides truth from error, you suddenly escape the difficulty which seems to have arisen in your mind, by falling back upon the notion of "one Supreme See and its possessor," communion with whom you virtually substitute for every other note of orthodoxy and catholicity. You, in fact, reduce the whole sum of Christianity to this simple question: Are you in communion with the "successor of St. Peter," the "Supreme earthly Head" of the Catholic Church?

It is truly curious to observe, by what a concurrence of weak arguments you prop up this untenable position. You happily steer clear of all the Apostle's copious expositions of the fulfilment of the type of the Levitical High Priesthood in Christ,* whose unchangeable priesthood and continual intercession for his Church in the true tabernacle, is so forcibly pointed out as the glory of the Christian covenant. Of that glory you rob the Church of Christ, in that, unable to apprehend the reality of Christ's spiritual presence with his Church, and the reality of the Church's spiritual

* The Epistle to the Hebrews generally, and especially ch. vii.—ix.

intercourse with Him, you speak of "the necessity of a centre of unity," because "it would be incredible that Christ should leave his kingdom in the world without any fixed government, or that government without an essential to all governments,—a supreme executive and centre of unity." The same blindness again, the same absence of the perception of faith! Christ's supreme government over his church is not, to your mind, a reality, because it is spiritual, and therefore can be apprehended only by faith. Therefore must you have an earthly antitype to the High Priest of the Levitical dispensation, whom you can see with the eye of your body. You claim such a Supreme earthly Head on the ground of the fanciful interpretation, plainly contradicted by Scripture, which you put upon the Mosaic institution; and, what seems still more incongruous, upon the ground of an analogy which you assume must subsist between the kingdom of Christ, and earthly kingdoms. You then labour to establish the extraordinary notion that St. Peter was appointed by Christ himself universal bishop, by forced interpretations put upon a few passages of Scripture; wholly forgetting that the total silence on this subject, of both the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and of the numerous apostolic Epistles addressed to a variety of churches, of which the Roman is one, would

of itself be fatal to your hypothesis, even if it could be made far more plausible than you have succeeded in making it by quoting, rather than by explaining, a few passages of the Gospels and Acts. You are next met by the not inconsiderable difficulty, that "so clear a perception of the designed succession to St. Peter, as the ninth and tenth centuries present," is not to be met with in the earlier ages of Christianity; but this difficulty you triumphantly surmount by an analogy drawn from horticulture, showing how "the strength, properties, and usefulness of a plant can only be developed as time permits its growth, and natural influences elicit its generic or specific characters;" how "every added inch, and expanding leaf, and swelling bud, leads the beholder to infer these"!!

You go on, it is true, to assert that "there is a very clear and ample recognition of the designed succession of St. Peter in the early Fathers, and most decisive confirmation of the fact of the existence of the primacy of the chair of St. Peter, and of its universal estimation, as the centre of unity to the kingdom of the Church;" but you wisely abstain from telling us, who those early Fathers are, in whose works you have made that discovery. To make up for this omission on your part, I have already given you in my last Letter a few specimens of the view which one

of the occupants of the alleged "Supreme See" took of the matter; and in my next Letter, in which the question of the Supremacy of the Roman See over the Church Catholic will come more fully under our consideration, I shall have occasion to furnish you with further references to the recorded sentiments of the early Church.

Meanwhile, I trust I have made good that part of my argument, which I undertook to prove in the present Letter. I have shown that the character of the Church is essentially spiritual and heavenly, that its realities are during the present dispensation to be apprehended by faith, and not by sight. I have also shown that you are a stranger to the perception of faith, that you seek to identify and realize the Church of Christ upon earth as a matter of sight; and that consequently the true character of Christ's Church must of necessity be hidden from you. Lastly, I have exposed the fallacies which run through your view of the Church; your notions of visible unity, of outward uniformity, of concentration under one Supreme earthly Head. I have but one remark to add in conclusion, which is, that although I cannot but lament that spiritual blindness which has led you into so much grievous error, it affords at least a pleasing confirmation of the charitable supposition with which I set out in my first Letter,—that, however inconsistent, and in some respects insincere, your

course may have been, intentional and conscious dishonesty cannot justly be laid to your charge.

With the sincere prayer that what I have now said in opposition to your views, may prove to have been spoken, not only against you, but for you,

I remain,

Your faithful brother in the Lord,

G. E. B.

Coombe Wood,
January 28, 1842.

Maurice and Co., Printers, Fenchurch-street.

Price 1*s.* 6*d.* LETTER I. OF

CATHOLICITY v. SIBTHORP;

Or, Some Help to answer the question, whether the REV. R. W. SIBTHORP, B.D. is now or ever was a Catholic?

In a series of Letters addressed to him by the REV. G. E. BIBER, LL.D., Presbyter of the Anglo-Catholic Church.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

1 *Vol.* 8*vo.* *Price* 14*s.*,

THE STANDARD OF CATHOLICITY,

Or an Attempt to point out in a plain Manner certain safe and leading Principles, amidst the conflicting Opinions by which the Church is at present agitated.

Price 1*s.*

OUR DAY OF SIFTING:

A plain SERMON for these perplexing Times, preached on New Year's Day, 1842, at St. Andrew's Church, Ham.

Also, Price 1*s.*,

THE LORD'S HOUSE:

A SERMON, preached on Sunday Evening, October 24th, 1841, at the *Chapel of Ease, Robinhood Hamlet*, in aid of the Funds now collecting for the Endowment of the said Chapel.

Published by Request, in aid of the Endowment Fund.

Also, Price 1*s.* 6*d.*,

THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

RECOMMENDED TO THE YOUNG,

IN A LETTER ADDRESSED TO HIS PUPILS.

And, Price 1*s.* 6*d.*,

GOD'S HOLY PRESENCE:

A LETTER ADDRESSED TO HIS PUPILS.

CATHOLICITY v. SIBTHORP;

OR,

SOME HELP TO ANSWER THE QUESTION,

WHETHER

THE REV. R. W. SIBTHORP, B.D.

IS NOW OR EVER WAS

A CATHOLIC?

IN A SERIES OF LETTERS ADDRESSED TO HIM

BY

THE REV. G. E. BIBER, LL.D.

Presbyter of the Anglo-Catholic Church.

Letter the Third.

LONDON:

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD; AND

WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;

AND JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

1842.

LONDON:
Printed by Maurice and Co., Fenchurch Street.

TO

THE REV. R. W. SIBTHORP.

Sir,

The third head of my argument, as sketched out at the beginning of my first Letter, is directed against your *assumptions* concerning the Roman Church, the groundlessness of which it is now my duty to establish, by showing that *your notions of the Roman, or, as you term her, the Catholic Church, have no foundation in history, any more than warrant in Scripture.*

As this is a wide and complicated subject, it will be conducive to clearness to state at the outset the order in which I mean to proceed. I purpose, then, to disprove, by the joint evidence of Scripture and Ecclesiastical History, as they respectively bear on each point, the following assumptions: That the Roman Church is orthodox; that she is characterized by fruits of holiness; that perfect unity and uniformity reign

within her; that she is universal; that she is ancient; and that her see is the Supreme See of Christendom. This being done, it will follow, by necessary consequence, that Rome, not the Anglican Church, is to blame for the separation which has taken place; and that Rome, not the Anglican Church, must change, in order to the restoration of Catholic communion between the two.

Your *first assumption*, then, is that *the Roman Church is orthodox*. There is in the manner in which you have handled this point, a good deal of that wisdom for which the Roman Church is far-famed; more, indeed, than might be looked for at the hands of a novice. Is it too much to conjecture that those who are "better judges than yourself" of that "call of duty" which brought your Letter to light, may have "deemed" it "foreign to your [and still more to their] purpose, to discuss the tenets in dispute" between the Roman Church and the Anglican? You admit the disputed points to be "not of a neutral character, not matter of indifference, nor of small moment, but of vital importance, and essential to sound faith to hold or to reject." If such they be, ought you to have "contented yourself with assuring us, that you carefully examined them, that you slowly received them; but that you are convinced of the soundness of the [Roman] Catholic doctrine concerning them all?" and again,

that on "examining the canons, and studying the catechism, of the Council of Trent, that most full, most admirable, and authoritative exposition of her creed," you came to the conclusion, that the Roman Church "has both Scripture and reason decisively on her side," that "her own authorized statements are thoroughly satisfactory?"

This is, indeed, an easy way of dealing with a difficult question; a thoroughly Romish method of demonstrating "Catholic verities." But I suspect you would hardly think it an answer, even to those very bare assertions of yours, if I were to imitate your example, and in return to assure you that on examining the Tridentine canons and catechism, I had found the authorized statements of the Roman Church contained in them, thoroughly unsatisfactory, contradictory both to Scripture and reason; or, that on studying the Articles of the Anglican Church, opposed to the Roman tenets, I had found them thoroughly satisfactory, in perfect accordance with both.

I am not aware that you would have a right to complain, if I chose to take that method of argument; but the very temper of the weapon I am handling, not the fencing-blade of a wily theology, but "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God," forbids my adopting a course so unworthy of the cause in which I am engaged. It cannot suffice me to meet your assertion of Rome's

orthodoxy by a counter-assertion of her heterodoxy: I feel called upon to make good my positions by adducing proof of their truth.

As it would be obviously impossible, within the limits to which I must confine myself on the present occasion, to enter upon a discussion of all the points at issue between the Anglican and the Roman Churches, it will be necessary for me to select some article of faith or other, on which the Roman Church is unsound, and which shall be of sufficient importance in itself, and in its bearings upon other verities, to warrant the conclusion that a church who in regard to it holds erroneous, unscriptural doctrine, has no claim to the character of an orthodox church. To this end you will, I doubt not, agree with me, that I could not do better than select the fundamental article of *the justification of the sinner before God.*

With regard to this point, the plain doctrine of Holy Scripture is as follows :—

Christ himself saith:

"As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that *whosoever believeth in him* should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth in him* should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. *He*

that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, *because he hath not believed* in the name of the only begotten Son of God."—*John* iii. 14—18.

"This is *the work of God, that ye believe* on him whom he hath sent."—*John* vi. 29.

"I am the resurrection and the life: *he that believeth in me*, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and *believeth in me* shall never die."—*John* xi. 25, 26.

St. Peter testifieth:

"The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ, ... he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead: to him give all the prophets witness, that *through his name whosoever believeth in him* shall receive remission of sins."—*Acts* x. 36, 42, 43.

"God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts *by faith*."—*Acts* xv. 8, 9.

In like manner St. Paul:

"Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him *all that believe are justified* from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."—*Acts* xiii. 38, 39.

"I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation *to every one that believeth;* to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For

therein is *the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith:* as it is written, The just shall live by *faith.*"—*Rom.* i. 16, 17.

"By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even *the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe:* for there is no difference: for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being *justified freely by his grace,* through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be *a propitiation through faith in his blood,* to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness: that he might be just, and *the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.* Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay, but by *the law of faith.* Therefore we conclude that *a man is justified by faith* without the deeds of the law. Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: seeing it is one God, which shall *justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.*"—*Rom.* iii. 20—30.

"If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham *believed* God, and it was *counted unto him for righteousness.* Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But *to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.*

Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God *imputeth righteousness without works*, saying, 'Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered: Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.' Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that *faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness.* How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And *he received the sign* of circumcision, *a seal of the righteousness of the faith* which he had, yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of *all them that believe*, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also: and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also *walk in the steps of that faith* of our father Abraham, which he had, being yet uncircumcised. For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but *through the righteousness of faith.*"—*Rom.* iv. 2—13; comp. *Gal.* iii. 6—14; v. 6.

"Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, *to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe* on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. Therefore *being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ:* by whom also *we have access by faith into this grace* wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God."—*Rom.* iv. 23—v. 2.

"What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even *the righteousness which is of faith.* But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? *Because they sought it not by faith,** but as it were by the works of the law. For they stumbled at that stumbling-stone; as it is written, 'Behold, I lay in Sion a stumbling-stone and rock of offence: and *whosoever believeth on him* shall not be ashamed.'"—*Rom* ix. 30—33; comp. *Phil.* iii. 8, 9.

"Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to *every one that believeth.* For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them. But *the righteousness which is of faith,* speaketh on this wise, 'Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above): or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead). But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, *the word of faith,* which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt *believe in thine heart,* that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For *with the heart man believeth unto righteousness,* and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."—*Rom.* x. 4—10.

---

* Neither does the Roman Church seek it by faith, but by the *opus operatum* of sacraments, which is one of the most striking points of analogy between carnal Israel of old, and the carnal Church of Rome, its supposed antitype.

Such is the Scriptural foundation upon which the Anglican Church rests her doctrine

"OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN."

"We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ *by faith*, and not for our own works or deservings: wherefore, that *we are justified by faith only*, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort."—*Art.* xi.

It would be hard, indeed, to deny, after the copious evidence I have adduced, that in that Article the Anglican Church has Scripture on her side; nor can it be contended that she insists on this doctrine to the neglect of good works, or to the disparagement of sacramental grace, seeing that on these subjects she plainly expresses herself as follows:—

"Albeit that GOOD WORKS, which *are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification*, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do *spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith*; insomuch that *by them a lively faith may be as evidently known*, as a tree discerned by the fruit."—*Art.* xii.

"SACRAMENTS ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain *sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace*, and God's good will towards us, *by the which he doth work invisibly in us*, and doth *not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.*"—*Art.* XXV.

"BAPTISM is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also *a sign of regeneration or new birth*, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of *forgiveness of sin*, and of *our adoption to be the sons of God* by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; *Faith is confirmed, and Grace increased* by virtue of prayer unto God."—*Art.* xxvii.

"THE SUPPER OF THE LORD is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is *a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death:* insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break, is *a partaking of the body of Christ*, and likewise the cup of blessing is *a partaking of the blood of Christ*."—*Art.* xxviii.

So careful is the Anglican Church to guard against a denial of the reality of sacramental grace as the fountain and sustenance of spiritual life, or against neglect of those good works without which "faith is dead:"* but on the other hand she strenuously contends for that fundamental principle of the Christian covenant, that the justification of man is solely and wholly *by faith* in Christ Jesus. Far, very far, is she from losing sight of that in-

* James ii. 17.

herent righteousness* begotten in the heart of the justified sinner by the operation of the Holy Ghost; far from neglecting or depreciating the means which Christ has appointed as signs, seals, and instruments of that operation; far from leading her members to think that the evidences of the existence and growth in them of that inherent righteousness can be wanting in a state of salvation, and consequently of actual justification by faith. But, at the same time she utterly repudiates the error so derogatory to the work of Christ,† that after "that perfect redemption,

* I cannot refrain from adducing the luminous statement of the "judicious Hooker" upon this fundamental point of difference between our Church and Rome: "There is a glorifying righteousness of men in the world to come: and there is a justifying and a sanctifying righteousness here. The righteousness, wherewith we shall be clothed in the world to come, is both perfect and inherent. That whereby here we are justified, is perfect, but not inherent. That whereby we are sanctified, inherent, but not perfect. This openeth a way to the plain understanding of that grand question, which hangeth yet in controversy between us and the Church of Rome, about the matter of justifying righteousness."—Hooker, *Sermon on Justification*, § 3.

† The Tridentine Fathers felt how serious an accusation it would be against their church, if she were said to derogate from the merit of Christ's work; and their manner of meeting, or rather anticipating, the charge, is perfectly in keeping with the spirit of that Council, and truly characteristic of Rome. They thus conclude their string of canons on Justification: "If any one shall say that by this Catholic doctrine of justification, set forth by the holy Synod in this

propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, made by Christ's one oblation of himself once offered,"* there can be either needed or admitted, in those who believe in the propitiatory offering of Christ, any other satisfaction or mode of expiation for the remission of sins, whether by the observance of any of the appointed ordinances of religion, or the performance of such other good works as are the fruits of justifying, that is, of lively faith. And not only will the Anglican Church not consent so to dishonour the dignity of Christ's sacrifice, but she will not suffer the justified sinner to fall into the presumption of thinking that he can, in any measure, or in any sense, contribute towards his own justification, (the very faith with which he receives it, being the gift of God;)† nor will

present Decree, the glory of God, or the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, are in any measure derogated from; and that the truth of our faith, and the glory of God and of Jesus Christ, are not rather illustrated by it: LET HIM BE ACCURSED."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* vi. *De justif. Can.* xxxiii. But however pointedly the Roman Church may apply this her favourite argument to the impugners of her doctrine of justification, the fact remains unchanged, that by her heretical doctrine she derogates from, and by her corrupt practice she altogether supplants, "the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;" a fact which in the progress of my argument will become abundantly apparent.

* Art. xxxi., and the *Prayer of Consecration in the Communion Service.*

† Eph. ii. 8, 9.

she deprive him of the freedom and the peace of a justified state, by representing to him his justification as a progressive, fluctuating, and laborious work, which not only can never be perfectly accomplished here on earth, but may, even at the moment of his departure hence, be painfully incomplete.

In these errors the Church of Rome is involved, notwithstanding all her occasional protestations to the contrary; and that not only, as has often been asserted, practically, in consequence of abuses and corruptions unauthorized by her, but doctrinally, by virtue of her own authorized statements.

The first step into this "maze which she causes her followers to tread, when they ask her the way of justification,"* she takes by making *baptism*, instead of *faith*, the primary means of applying to the sinner the justifying righteousness of Christ:

"If any one asserts that this sin of Adam,—which is originally one, and being transmitted by propagation, not imitation, is in all, and in each individual his very own sin,—is taken away by the strength of man's nature, or by any other remedy than by the merit of the one Mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath reconciled us unto God by his blood being made unto us righteousness, sanctification, redemption; or denies that *this*

* Hooker, *Sermon on Justification*, § 5.

same merit of Jesus Christ is applied, both to adults and infants, *by the sacrament of Baptism,* rightly administered, according to the form of the Church: let him be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* v. *De peccato originali. c.* iii.

In this statement the error of the Tridentine doctrine is scarcely perceptible, because it is not to be denied, that in the sacrament of Baptism there is "a mystical washing away of sin," and that they who are rightly baptized, do therein "receive remission of their sins by spiritual regeneration."* Nor does this, rightly understood, militate against the doctrine of justification by faith; seeing that faith itself, whereby the sinner lays hold upon the sacrifice of Christ, is the gift of God, wrought in the soul by the operation of the Holy Ghost. In the case of infants, although the poor weak vessel of their souls is as yet unable to exercise or evidence any gift, natural or spiritual, yet we may well believe that He who gives to them the covenant-promise of pardon, in the sacrament of Baptism, does not leave their souls destitute of the spiritual gift of faith, without which the promise can never be apprehended. Nor may we doubt,

* See the two first prayers in the "*Ministration of Public Baptism,*" both "*of infants*" and "*of adults;*" the expressions of which are fully warranted by the language of Scripture itself. See 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21; Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5—7.

that it is by virtue of that gift, so bestowed, (not *ex opere operato*, but in answer to the prayers of the Church claiming Christ's promise for the child,) that children are, as they grow up, enabled to learn, not only by the outward ear, but by the inward hearing of faith, both "what a solemn vow, promise, and profession" was made in their name, and also what inestimable benefits were granted unto them, in their baptism. In the case of adults, on the contrary, it is still more evident, that as, on the one hand, the faith wrought in the mind by the preventing grace of the Holy Ghost must of necessity lead the believer to seek baptism, as soon as it has arrived at such a state of ripeness as to lay hold effectually on the benefit of redemption through the merit of Christ's death, and thereby to become justifying faith, so on the other hand the free and confident exercise of that faith will be greatly aided and strengthened by receiving in the sacrament of Baptism the seal of God's acceptance, and the pledge of participation in the privileges and promises of his covenant.

Whether, therefore, we consider the case of infants or of adults, it is clear that the individual baptized has, in either case, an interest in the merit of Christ's propitiatory offering after baptism, which he had not before; an interest, not only externally by the covenant promise of the imputed righteousness of Christ, but internally

Baptism, delivered from all infirmity of nature: nay rather, as we have all to contend against the motions of concupiscence which ceaseth not to incite us to sin, there is hardly (!!) any one to be found, who so strenuously resists, or so vigilantly guards his salvation, as to succeed in avoiding every snare.

"Since, therefore, it was necessary that there should be in the Church *a power to remit sins, by some other method besides the sacrament of Baptism,* the keys of the kingdom of heaven were entrusted to her, whereby to every penitent person his transgressions might be forgiven, even though he should sin to the last day of his life . . . . .

"But if we look to the Ministers of this divine power, it will appear to be less extensive [than as regards the nature of the sin pardoned, or the time of remission.] For the Lord has given the power of so holy a gift not to all, but only to Bishops and Priests. And the same is to be held as regards the method of exercising that power: for *sins can be remitted only through the Sacraments, if their form be adhered to;* otherwise there is no right given to the Church to absolve from sin. Whence it follows, that *both Priests and Sacraments are endued with power for the forgiveness of sins, as instruments, by which Christ the Lord,* who is the author and granter of salvation, *effects in us remission of sins and righteousness."—Catech. Concil. Trident.* Pars* i. *Art.* x. *s.* 3, 4, 6.

---

* I quote from the authorized Mechlin edition of the Latin text, (1831); the Maynooth edition in English by the Rev. J. Donovan being rather a paraphrase than a translation, and occasionally, as in the section above quoted, an abridgment of the original.

Here, then, there is the full developement of the error which begins imperceptibly in the substitution of baptism for faith, as the means whereby the justifying righteousness of Christ is individually appropriated. That righteousness which is freely imputed to the believer for Christ's sake, which is in itself complete and perfect, and admits of no partition,—a man being either justified or "yet in his sins,"—becomes in the Tridentine view of it the fruit of observances, requiring constant renewal by recurrence to observances, and remaining incomplete to the last; subject, at the same time, all along to the adjudication of fallible men, doled out by them, as will presently more plainly appear, not according to the liberality of a gracious God, but according to a mercenary rule which, while it makes the grace of God the reward of human exertions for its attainment, exacts at the hands of man a price for that which God has freely given. Justification thus again ceases to be of grace, it is again of debt; the way to attain it, is by works, not by faith; and the ministration of the mysteries of grace to men who have peace with God, which is a ministration of life, becomes once more a ministration of death, because a ministration of ordinances to those who "through fear of death are all their life-time subject to bondage." It is impossible to conceive a more glaring violation of

the principle which, in the very act of wielding the power of binding and loosing, the Apostle so strenuously maintains: "Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy: for by faith ye stand."*

I shall now subjoin a number of extracts from the authorized statements of the Roman Church, for the purpose of setting the error of confounding imputed and inherent righteousness in a clearer light, and showing the consequences to which that confusion necessarily must lead, and actually has led, in her doctrinal system.

The Tridentine exposition of that system represents justification as incomplete, gradually and partially acquired:—

"*Of the increase of justification received.*—Those that are so justified, and become the friends of God, and members of his household, proceeding from virtue to virtue, are, as the Apostle saith, renewed from day to day; that is, by mortifying their fleshly members, and yielding them as instruments of righteousness unto sanctification, *through the observance of the commands of God and of the Church, they grow* by the co-operation of faith with their good works, *in that very righteousness which they have received* by the grace of Christ, and are *increasingly justified;* as it is written,†

* 2 Cor. i. 24.

† Notwithstanding your general assurance that Rome's own authorized statements are "thoroughly satisfactory" to your mind, I venture to express a hope that you will

'He that is righteous let him be righteous still;' and again, 'Fear not [defer not] until death to be justified;' and again, 'Ye see how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.' And for this increase of righteousness Holy Church asks when she prays: 'Give us, O Lord, the increase of faith, hope, and charity.' "—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* vi. *Decr. de Justif. c.* x.

"If any one shall say, that righteousness received is not preserved, yea, and even *increased* before God, *by good works;* but that those works are merely fruits and evidences of justification obtained, and not *the cause of increased justification:* let him be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* vi. *De Justif. can.* xxiv.

Justification thus progressively attained, is, according to the Tridentine doctrine, not only the gift of God, but the reward justly due to good works: —

"Therefore to such as walk in good works unto the end, and place their hope in God, eternal life is to be held out, both as a gift of grace mercifully promised to

---

yourself class at least the two first of the passages here alleged, among "the texts of Scripture alleged in proof of this or that doctrine, that cannot, to your judgment, be brought to bear on it." The quotation from *James* ii. 24, has no doubt a plausible bearing upon the question; but what has the Apocalyptic Decree, *Rev.* xxii. 11, or the Apocryphal advice, *Ecclesiasticus* xviii. 22, to do with the doctrine of "increasing justification?" The latter, by the way, affords a fair specimen of the fidelity of the infallible Vulgate: Μὴ μείνῃς, is the Greek, *Ne verearis*, the Latin.

God's children through Christ Jesus, and as *a reward to be faithfully rendered,* according to God's own promise, *to their good works and merits.* For this is that crown of righteousness which the Apostle affirmed was laid up for him after his fight fought, and his course run, to be given to him by the righteous Judge, and not to him only, but unto all them that love his appearing. For since that same Christ Jesus continually instils,—as the head into the members, and the vine into the branches,—into those that are justified, a virtue which ever precedes, accompanies, and follows, their good works, and without which they could not in any way be acceptable to God and meritorious, nothing is to be held wanting in those that are justified, to prevent the belief, that by those works which are wrought in God, they have fully satisfied the divine law according to the state of this life present, and have *truly merited for themselves eternal life,* to be attained by them in due time, provided they depart in a state of grace: because our Saviour Christ saith, 'Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.' Thus neither is our own righteousness established, as if it were altogether our own, nor is God's righteousness overlooked or rejected. For that righteousness which is called our own, because *by it, inherent in us, we are justified,* is at the same time also the righteousness of God, forasmuch as it is infused into us by God through the merit of Christ."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* vi. *Decr. de Justif. c.* xvi.

"If any one shall say, that *the sinner is justified by*

faith only, understanding thereby, that nothing else is required as co-operating to the attainment of the grace of justification, and that it is in no way necessary for him to be *prepared and disposed by the motion of his own will:* let him be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* vi. *De Justif. can.* ix

" If any one shall say, that *men are justified either by the imputation of Christ's righteousness only, or by the remission of sins only;* grace and love, to be shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and to be inherent in them, being excluded; or else, that *the grace by which we are justified, is only God's favour:* let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* xi.

" If any one shall say, that *justifying faith is nothing else than trust in God's mercy, remitting sins for Christ's sake,* or that *it is this trust alone whereby we are justified:* let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* xii.

" If any one shall say, that the good works of a justified man are *the gifts of God in such a sense as not to be at the same time the good deservings of him who is justified:* or that he who is justified, does not by good works, wrought by him through the grace of God and the merit of Jesus Christ of whom he is a lively member, *truly merit an increase of grace, life eternal, and the attainment of life eternal,* provided he depart in a state of grace, *yea, and increase of glory:* let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* xxxii.

The doctrine thus plainly laid down of a progressive justification, by inherent righteousness, to be attained by the meritorious exertions of man himself, leads inevitably to a system of means whereby justification, partly or wholly for-

feited, may be recovered, and an increase of it may be obtained. The first place among these means is assigned to the sacraments of the Roman Church :—

" For the completion of *the wholesome doctrine of justification,* promulgated in the last session by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, it has been thought fit to treat of *the most holy Sacraments of the Church, through which all true righteousness either begins, or, being begun, is increased, or, being lost, is recovered.*"—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* vii. *Decr. de Sacram. Proœm.*

From this introductory statement it is evident that the grace spoken of in the subsequent canons is *the grace of justification ;* which it is important to bear in mind, in order to collect the full meaning of them, and to trace in them the doctrine of progressive justification by means of the sacraments. Of those canons the two following are particularly deserving of notice :—

" If any one shall say, that the sacraments of the new law* are not necessary to salvation, but superfluous, and that *men obtain from God the grace of justification by faith only,* without them, or the wish for them,—albeit they are not all necessary for each indi-

* Most truly called *the new law ;* for under the influence of the Tridentine doctrines the covenant of grace becomes a second law, identical in its spirit with the old law, differing from it only in the form of its appointments, and essentially opposed to that " perfect law of liberty," which is promulgated in the Gospel.

vidual:—let him be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* vii. *De Sacram. can.* iv.

"If any one shall say, that grace is not conferred by *the sacraments* of the new law *themselves,* by *virtue of the act performed,* [*ex opere operato,*] but that *faith alone in God's promise is sufficient to obtain grace:* let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* viii.

To the same effect are the statements of the Catechism:—

"The virtue which emanates from Christ's passion, that is, the grace which he has merited for us on the altar of the cross, must be caused to flow into us through the sacraments as through a kind of channel: else there could not remain for any one the least hope of salvation. Wherefore the Lord most merciful has by his word and faithful promise determined to leave in the Church the sacraments, through which we might without doubt believe that *the fruit of his passion is actually communicated to us;* if we would but all piously and religiously come to this healing."—*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars* ii. *De Sacram.* § 13.

"Since it is God who makes men righteous, and *the sacraments themselves are certain wonderful instruments for obtaining righteousness,* it is plain that one and the same God in Christ must be acknowledged as the author both of justification and of the sacraments."—*Ibid.* § 21.

"The first place [among the effects of the sacraments] is due to that grace which in the language of the holy Doctors we call *justifying grace.*"—*Ibid.* § 26.

The doctrine thus laid down with regard to

sacraments generally, is asserted with equal distinctness in reference to each of those sacraments which in the Tridentine view are the means of justification. Touching Baptism this has already been proved. The "Sacrament of Penance" comes next in order :—

"If there were in all that are regenerate such gratitude towards God, as to make them constantly preserve the righteousness put on in baptism by his gift and grace, there had been no need for Him to have instituted *another sacrament for the remission of sins.* But since God, who is rich in mercy, knew our frame, He provided a remedy of life even for those who should afterwards deliver themselves into the bondage of sin and under the dominion of Satan, namely, *the sacrament of penance, by which the benefit of Christ's death is applied* to those who have fallen into sin after baptism."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xiv. *Doctr. de sanctiss. Pœnit. et Extr. Unct. Sacram. c.* i.

"This sacrament [of penance] is distinguished from baptism as differing from it in many ways. For besides that the matter and form, by which the essence of the sacrament is effected, is widely different, it is surely evident, that the Minister of baptism need not be a Judge, since the Church passeth judgment upon no one who has not previously entered into her by the door of baptism. 'For what have I to do,' saith the Apostle, 'to judge them also that are without?' It is otherwise with regard to them that are of the household of faith, whom the Lord Christ has once by the laver of baptism made members of his body. For if

these should afterwards contaminate themselves by some crime, he willed them not to be washed by reiterated baptism, since this is on no account permitted in the Catholic Church, but to be placed as criminals before this tribunal, that they might be *delivered by the sentence of the priests*, not once, but as often as they should penitently fly to it from the sins committed by them. Besides the fruit of baptism is other than that of penance. For by baptism, putting on Christ, we are made in Him a new creature altogether, obtaining *full and entire remission of all our sins: but to this newness and entireness we can in no wise attain by the sacrament of penance, without many tears and labours on our part, divine justice demanding this:* so that penance was rightly termed by the holy Fathers *a kind of laborious baptism.* This sacrament of penance, however, is as necessary to salvation for those that have fallen into sin after baptism, as baptism itself for those who are not yet regenerate."—*Ibid. c.* ii.

"*The substance and effect of this sacrament,* [of penance,] as regards its power and efficacy, *is reconciliation with God,* whereupon is wont to follow at times in pious men, and such as devoutly receive this sacrament, peace of conscience and cheerfulness with vehement consolation of the Spirit."—*Ibid. c.* iii.

"If any one shall say, that he who has fallen into sin after baptism, cannot by God's grace arise; or, that he can indeed do so, but that he may *recover his lost righteousness by faith alone, without the sacrament of penance,* according as the holy Roman and universal Church, instructed by the Lord Christ and his Apostles, has hitherto professed, observed, and taught: let him

be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* vi. *De Justif. can.* xxix.

"If any one shall say, that there is not in the Catholic Church *penance, truly and properly a sacrament* instituted by Christ our Lord, *for reconciling the faithful unto God,* as often as they fall into sin after baptism: let him be accursed."—*Ibid. Sess.* xiv. *De sanctiss. Pœnit. Sacram. can.* i.

"If any one, confounding the sacraments, shall say, that baptism itself is the sacrament of penance, as if these two sacraments were not distinct, and that therefore penance is not rightly termed *the second plank after shipwreck:* let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* ii.

"He who offends God by some mortal sin, forthwith *loses whatever merits he has obtained from the death and cross of Christ; and is shut out from all access to paradise,* which, being previously closed, our Saviour has opened unto all by his passion; and when this is thought on, we cannot but be seized with vehement solicitude, through the consideration of man's miserable estate. But if we direct our mind back to *this wonderful power given to the Church by God,* and, strengthened by the faith of this Article, believe that every one has the means offered him, by which he may with God's help be *restored to his former state of dignity;* then are we compelled to rejoice with exceeding joy and gladness, and to render unto God immortal thanks. . . . .

"The Lord gave unto the Church the power of remitting sins for this reason, that all might use this wholesome remedy: for as *no one can be reconciled* [expiated] *without baptism,* so whoever desires to recover *the grace of baptism, lost through deadly sins,* must neces-

sarily *have recourse to another kind of expiation,* namely the sacrament of Penance."—*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars* i. *Art.* x. §§ 10, 11.

"There is *no sin so grievous and nefarious,* that *the sacrament of Penance may not blot it out,* and that not once, but twice and again."—*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars* ii. *De Pœnit. Sacram.* § 23.

"This is the proper effect of penance, that it blots out sins, so much so that *without penance the remission of sins may not be obtained, nay not even hoped for.*"—*Ibid.* § 25.

But to attain to a more full knowledge of the bearing which "the sacrament of penance" has upon the sinner's justification, it is necessary to follow the Tridentine doctrine into the analysis it presents of the component parts of penance:—

"The matter, as it were, of this sacrament are the acts of the penitent himself, namely *contrition, confession,* and *satisfaction:* which, forasmuch as they are by God's ordinance *required* in the penitent for the integrity of the sacrament, and *for the full and perfect remission of his sins,* are on that account termed *the parts of penance.*"—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xiv. *Doctr. de sanctiss. Pœnit. et Extr. Unct. Sacram. c.* iii.

"If any one shall deny, that *to the entire and perfect remission of sins three acts are necessary* in the penitent, the matter, as it were, of the sacrament of penance, namely *contrition, confession, and satisfaction,* which are called *the three parts of penance:* or shall say that there are only two parts of penance, namely, terror excited in the conscience by the acknowledgment of sin, and

faith drawn from the Gospel or from absolution, whereby a man believes that his sins are remitted him through Christ: let him be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xiv. *De sanctiss. Pœnit. Sacram. can.* iv.

"Of these three parts [of penance] this account may be given: that sins are committed against God by thought, word, and deed; and that therefore it was meet, that submitting ourselves to the keys of the Church, we should *endeavour to appease God's wrath, and to obtain from him the pardon of our sins* by the same means by which we have transgressed against his most holy name."—*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars* ii. *De Pœnit. Sacram.* § 29.

Of these three "parts of the Sacrament of Penance," those which chiefly illustrate the Tridentine doctrine of justification, are the two last-named, confession and satisfaction. Of the former the account given is as follows:—

"From the institution of the sacrament of penance already set forth, the universal Church has ever understood that there is likewise *an entire confession of sins* instituted by the Lord, and by divine right *necessary for all who after baptism have fallen into sin;* because our Lord Jesus Christ, when about to ascend from earth to heaven, left the priests for his vicegerents, for governors as it were, and judges, before whom should be brought all mortal crimes into which Christ's faithful people should fall, in order that by virtue of the power of the keys, they might *pronounce sentence either of remission, or of retention of sins* . . . . . Thence it follows, that penitents must *enumerate in confession all mortal sins* of which after diligent examination of them-

selves they are conscious, even though they be ever so secret, and committed only against the two last precepts of the Decalogue,* which latter sins sometimes wound the soul more deeply and are more dangerous than sins openly committed. For *venial sins*, by which we are not excluded from God's grace, and into which we fall more frequently, although they may be rightly and usefully, and without any presumption, mentioned in confession, as the custom of pious persons proves, may yet without guilt be passed over in silence and *expiated by many other remedies*.† But as all *mortal sins*, even of thought, make men the children of wrath, and enemies of God, it is necessary to seek at God's hand *the pardon also of them all by open and modest confession* . . . . . It follows, moreover, that those circumstances also must be explained in confession, which alter the nature of the sin, because without them the sins cannot be entirely disclosed by the peni-

---

* *i. e.* sins of evil concupiscence, the first two commandments being formed into one, and the last divided into two, in the Roman arrangement.

† On this expiation of venial sins, the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas, set forth in the Maynooth *Manual*, is as follows:

"By what means are venial sins remitted? St. Thomas reduces them to three kinds:

"Of the first kind are *the Sacraments*, by which grace is conferred, and the fervour of love increased.

"Of the second kind are *penitential means*, adopted with some emotion of abhorrence from sin, as for instance, general confession, smiting the breast, recitation of the Lord's Prayer, &c., and these things are efficacious by virtue of the act of him who does them, *(ex opere operantis)*.

"Of the third kind are *sacramental means*, and all such

tents, or known to the judges; and it is, therefore, impossible that the latter should form a right opinion of the grievousness of the crimes, and *impose the proper punishment for them upon the penitents* . . . . . But the very difficulty of such a confession, and the shame of revealing sins, might indeed appear grievous, were it not alleviated by so many and so great advantages and consolations, which are *most certainly bestowed by absolution* upon all who worthily approach this sacrament." —*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xiv. *Doctr. de sanctiss. Pœnit. et Extr. Unct. Sacram. c.* v.

" If any one shall deny, that sacramental confession is either instituted, or necessary to salvation, by divine right; or shall say that the method of secret confession to the priest alone, which the Catholic Church has always from the beginning observed, and still observes, is different from Christ's institution and commandment, and a human invention: let him be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xiv. *De sanctiss. Pœnit. Sacram. can.* vi.

" If any one shall say, that in the sacrament of pe-

---

as contain some emotion of reverence towards God, or divine things: for instance, the use of sacramental rites, sprinkling with holy water, episcopal or sacerdotal benediction; these, however, are efficacious not by virtue of the act done *(ex opere operato)*, but inasmuch as they objectively induce abhorrence from sin, as likewise through impetration of grace on account of the prayers and worship of the Church. Thus, for example, when one uses holy water, the prayers recited in the name of the Church in the benediction of that water, and which continue in acceptance before God, are applied to that man, as if they had been recited for him."—*Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theolog. p.* iii. *quest.* lxxxvii. *art.* 3; *ap. Dens Theol. Mor. et Dogm. tom.* vi. *n.* 35.

nance it is not *by divine right necessary for the remission of sins, to confess all and singular mortal sins*, which are, upon due and diligent previous meditation, remembered,—even secret ones, and such as are against the two last commandments of the Decalogue,—as well as the circumstances which alter the nature of a sin; but that such confession is merely useful for the instruction and consolation of the penitent, and was anciently observed only for the imposing of canonical satisfaction: or shall say, that those who desire to confess all sins, will leave nothing to be pardoned by the mercy of God: or lastly, that it is not lawful to confess venial sins: let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* vii.

Out of the power arrogated by the Priests of the Roman Church to take cognizance in auricular confession of all the sins of the faithful classed by them under the category of mortal sins, including among them the most secret thoughts of the heart, and to "impose the proper punishment for them upon the penitents," naturally grows the doctrine of "satisfaction," that is to say, of expiation of sins by the performance of acts of penance, or in other words, by the endurance of the punishments imposed by the priests:

"There never was any way accounted in the Church of God more certain for *averting punishment impending from the Lord*, than the frequent use of these *works of penance* with true grief of mind. Moreover, while *in making satisfaction we suffer for our sins*, we are made conformable to Christ Jesus, who made satisfaction for our sins, and of whom is all our sufficiency; having thereby

also the most certain pledge that if we suffer with him, we shall be also glorified together. Neither is this satisfaction which we make for our sins, our satisfaction in such a sense as not to be so through Christ Jesus; for whereas we are unable of ourselves to do any thing as of ourselves, we can do all things if He work with us who strengtheneth us. Thus man has not whereof to glory, but all our glorying is in Christ: in whom we live, *in whom we gain merit, in whom we make satisfaction*, bringing forth worthy fruits of penance, which derive their efficacy from Him, are by Him offered unto the Father, and through Him accepted of the Father. All the Lord's priests therefore are bound, according as the Spirit and prudence shall suggest, to *enjoin in proportion to the quality of the crimes and the ability of the penitents, wholesome and suitable satisfactions:* lest, if they connive at sins, and deal too indulgently with the penitents, enjoining some exceedingly light works for very grievous transgressions, they be made partakers of other men's sins. And they are to keep in view, that the satisfaction which they impose, is to be not only a safeguard of newness of life, and a remedy of infirmity, but also *an avenging and punishment of past sins*. For that the keys of the priests are given to them not only for loosing, but also for binding, the ancient Fathers also both believe and teach. Nor did they on that account imagine the sacrament of penance to be a tribunal of wrath or of punishments; as also no Catholic ever held that by such our satisfactions the efficacy of the merit and satisfaction of our Lord Jesus Christ is either obscured, or in any way diminished: which construction the innovators put upon them, and so teach newness of life to be the best penance, in such a manner

as to take away all the efficacy and use of satisfaction." —*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xiv. *Doctr. de sanctiss. Pœnit. et Extr. Unct. Sacram. c.* viii.

" Moreover [the holy synod] teaches, that so great is the liberality of the divine bounty, that *we are enabled to make satisfaction* before God the Father through Jesus Christ, not only *by punishments taken upon ourselves of our own accord for the avenging of sin, or imposed upon us by the discretion of the priest, according to the measure of our transgression,* but also (which is the greatest proof of love) by temporal scourgings inflicted by God,* and patiently endured by us."—*Ibid. c.* ix.

" If any one shall say, that the whole punishment is always remitted by God together with the guilt, and that *the satisfaction of penitents is none other than the faith whereby they apprehend Christ's satisfaction made for them :* let him be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xiv. *De sanctiss. Pœnit. Sacram. can.* xii.

" If any one shall say, that there is not, as regards temporal punishment, any kind of *satisfaction for sins,* made unto God through the merits of Christ, *by punishments* inflicted by Him and patiently endured, or else *enjoined by the priest,* nor *by punishments voluntarily taken upon ourselves, such as fastings, prayers,*† *alms-*

---

* This doctrine of temporal punishments reserved by God in the pardon of sins, will presently come under consideration.

† Prayers a *punishment !!* What becomes of the boasted piety of the Roman Church, if her prayers are not the fervent devotion of filial love, but the self-inflicted punishment of slavish fear?

deeds, and other works of piety, and that consequently mere newness of life is the best penance: let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* xiii.

" If any one shall say, that *the satisfactions by which penitents redeem their sins* through Christ Jesus, are not a worshipping of God, but human traditions, obscuring the doctrine of grace,* the true worship of God, and the very benefit of Christ's death: let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* xiv.

" If any one shall say, that the keys of the Church are given only for loosing, and not also for binding; and that therefore the priests, *in imposing punishments upon those who confess their sins,* act contrary to the end of the keys and to Christ's institution; and that it is a fiction to say, that after eternal punishment taken

---

* It is curious to observe, that however easily the Church of Rome reconciles these human works of satisfaction with the doctrine of God's free grace, and of the all-sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice, she is by no means equally pliant when the dignity of one sacrament as compared with another, is at stake. The same Church who can see no derogation from the merit of Christ's death in the notion that a man should make satisfaction for himself by works of penance, and by the endurance of sufferings, both here and in purgatory; nay, even in the idea that one man may make satisfaction for another; (see the next following note); yet professes herself to have " always understood, that without the greatest possible injury to the dignity of the sacrament, such offices of piety as the holy Fathers usually term works of satisfaction, cannot be imposed upon him who is to be reconciled in baptism." —*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars* ii. *De Baptismi Sacram.* § 45. Compare with this the 33rd *Canon on Justification,* quoted above, p. 13. note.

away by the power of the keys, there remains for the most part a temporal punishment to be undergone: let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* xv.

"*Satisfaction is the full payment of a debt;* for whatever is such as to satisfy [*quod satis est*], in that there appears to be nothing wanting. Therefore when we speak of *the reconciliation of grace,* "to satisfy," means to do to another as much as may be *sufficient to his angered mind by way of vengeance for the injury offered him:* and thus *satisfaction is nothing else than compensation for an injury done to another.* And as regards the present question, the doctors of things divine have used the name of satisfaction to signify *the compensation which takes place, when man makes some payment to God for sins committed.*" *—*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars* ii. *De Pœnit. Sacram.* § 85.

"Every kind of satisfaction is chiefly referable to these three heads, *prayer, fasting, almsdeeds. . . . . By prayer we appease God;* by almsdeeds we make satis-

---

* Among the impieties connected with this doctrine of satisfaction, is the assertion made in the most unqualified terms, that one man may make satisfaction for another: "In this the sovereign goodness and clemency of God is to be extolled with signal praise and thanksgiving, that He has made for human infirmity this allowance, that *one man may make satisfaction for another. . . . .* No one, indeed, can be contrite, or confess, for another; but *they who are endowed with divine grace, may pay unto God, in the name of another, that which is due to Him.* Whereby it comes to pass, that one man seems by some means to bear another man's burden."—*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars* ii. *De Pœnit. Sacram.* §§ 109, 110. Compare *Pars* i. *Art.* ix. §§ 25, 26, 27.

faction to our neighbour; and by fasting we chastise ourselves."—*Ibid.* §§ 105, 107.

"It has been so ordered by God, that by this threefold remedy the salvation of man should be promoted. For as by sinning we either offend against God, or wrong our neighbours, or injure ourselves, so *by holy prayers we render God propitious;* by almsdeeds we *redeem our offences* against other men; by fasting we *wash out our own life's filth.* And although each of these remedies is useful against every kind of sin, yet is each of them in particular apposite and appropriate to those sins which we have mentioned."—*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars* iv. *Quæ ratio in orando req.* § 15.

Thus far the justification of the sinner, which Scripture attributes invariably to faith in the all-sufficient propitiation of Christ's death, has, agreeably to the Roman doctrine, proceeded, as a progressive work, the fruit of observances, throughout life, beginning in the sacrament of baptism, and continued in the sacrament of penance with all its component parts. At length the sinner arrives at the close of his earthly pilgrimage, and here again he meets with another ordinance by which a further, though it may not be a final, portion of his justification is wrought out:—

"The holy synod has thought fit to annex to the foregoing doctrine of penance, what follows concerning *the sacrament of Extreme Unction:* which has been accounted by the Fathers as *consummative* not only *of penance,* but of the whole Christian life, which ought to

be a perpetual penance."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xiv. *Doctr. de Sacram. Extr. Unct. Pr.*

"This substance [of the sacrament of Extreme Unction] is the grace of the Holy Spirit, whose anointing *wipes off any transgressions which may yet remain to be expiated, and the remnants of sin,* and eases and strengthens the soul of the sick by exciting in him great trust in God's mercy."—*Ibid. c.* ii.

"If any one shall say, that Extreme Unction is not *truly and properly a sacrament,* instituted by Christ our Lord, and promulgated by the blessed apostle James, but only a rite handed down from the Fathers, or a human invention: let him be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xiv. *De Sacram. Extr. Unct. can.* i.

"If any one shall say, that the holy anointing of the sick does not confer grace, *nor remit sins,* nor ease the sick, but that it has ceased, as if the gift of healing had only existed of old: let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* ii.

"By this sacrament that grace is conferred which *remits sins,* and that chiefly of the lighter kind, *venial sins,* as they are commonly called: for *deadly sins are taken away by the sacrament of penance.* Neither was this sacrament [of extreme unction] primarily instituted for the remission of more grievous crimes, but baptism and penance only have in themselves efficacy to do this."—*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars* ii. *De Extr. Unct. Sacram.* § 27.

But although Extreme Unction is represented as the *consummative* sacrament, it by no means follows, that the satisfaction to be made by the sinner ends there, or that with it his justification

is complete. There remains, or may remain, (the case being one for individual adjudication, left in doubt and suspense,) a further satisfaction by suffering to be made by the departed sinner in the unseen world, the expiation of the undischarged portion of his debt by the pains of purgatory. This fearful and dark superstition takes its origin in the doctrine which has already incidentally been noticed,* of the reservation of temporal punishments on the part of God in that release which He gives for eternal punishments only, according to Tridentine doctrine, in the sacraments of Baptism and of Penance. The following quotations will further illustrate it:—

"The holy synod declares that it is altogether false, and contrary to God's word, to say, that guilt is never remitted by the Lord, but that all punishment is at the same time forgiven. For there are clear and notable examples to be met with in the holy Scriptures,† by

---

* See above, p. 37, the extract from ch. ix. of the "*Doctrine of the most holy Sacraments of Penance and of Extreme Unction*," and the Canons xii. xiii. and xv. next following, on the same subject.

† The cases referred to in the margin are those of our first parents, Gen. iii.; of David, 2 Sam. xii.; of Miriam, Aaron, and Moses, Numb. xii. and xx. Without entering into a discussion of all the questions arising out of these cases, it will be sufficient to observe that it is no where written of any of the punishments there mentioned, that they were inflicted *for the expiation of sins*, which is the point at issue.

which, as well as by divine tradition, this error is most evidently confuted. Indeed *the very principle of divine justice seems to demand* that there should be a difference, in the manner of receiving them into a state of grace, between those who before baptism have sinned through ignorance, and those who having once been delivered from the bondage of sin and of Satan, and having received the gift of the Holy Ghost, have not been afraid knowingly to defile the temple of God, and to grieve the Holy Spirit. And it is *becoming the divine clemency, that our sins should not be forgiven to us without any satisfaction,* in such a manner, as thereby to give us occasion to think lightly of sin, and to fall, as persons injurious, treating the Holy Ghost with contumely, into more grievous sins, treasuring up for ourselves wrath against the day of wrath."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xiv. *Doctr. de sanctiss. Pœnit. et Extr. Unct. Sacram. c.* viii.

" Since many and various afflictions and calamities press upon us while we are in this life, the faithful are to be particularly instructed that those who with a patient mind endure whatever trouble or misfortune God may lay upon them, have obtained abundant *matter of satisfaction and of merit:* while those who unwillingly and reluctantly bear such punishment, are deprived of all *fruit of satisfaction,* but only experience the chastisement and punishment of God, who in righteous judgment takes vengeance upon their sins."—*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars* ii. *De Pœnit. Sacram.* § 108.

" If any one shall say, that *after the grace of justification received, every penitent sinner's guilt is remitted, and*

his liability to eternal punishment done away with, in such a manner, as that *there remains no liability to temporal punishment* to be discharged, either *in this world*, or in the next *in purgatory*, before he can have access to the kingdom of heaven: let him be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* vi. *De Justif. can.* xxx.

"Besides there is *the purgatorial fire, in which the souls of the godly being tormented for a definite time are reconciled* [*expiated*], *in order that an entrance may be ministered unto them into their eternal home*, into which nothing that is defiled, does enter. And of the truth of this doctrine which the holy councils declare to be confirmed both by the testimony of Scripture and by apostolic tradition, the Pastor will have to discourse the more diligently and frequently, because we have fallen upon those times in which men will not endure *sound* (!) doctrine."—*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars* i. *Art.* v. § 5.

Thus, then, the sinner's justification, so far from being perfected by Christ's "oblation of himself once offered," and requiring on the sinner's part faith only to apprehend this deep mystery of divine love and mercy, is, on the contrary, according to the doctrine of the Council of Trent, a work accomplished by little and little, extending not only over the whole of his earthly pilgrimage, but reaching forth into the state after death, for an indefinite space of time. Without a full view of the length to which the Roman Church carries this unscriptural doctrine of progressive and incomplete justification, it is impos-

sible to appreciate in all its bearings that perversion of Christ's holy institution, the Sacrament of his body and blood, which under the name of the "Sacrifice of the Mass," she puts forth as the crowning imposture of "the mystery of iniquity." For the better understanding of this point, her "authorized statements" on the nature of the holy Eucharist will first claim our attention:

"The sacrament of the most holy Eucharist has this in common with the other sacraments, that it is the symbol of a holy thing, and the visible form of an invisible grace; but there is found in it moreover this singular excellency, that *the other sacraments have a sanctifying power only when one uses them: whereas in the Eucharist the very author of holiness Himself exists before its use*: for the Apostles had not yet received the Eucharist from the Lord's hand, when he of a truth affirmed to them, that what He gave them, was his body. And this faith has ever been held in the Church of God, that *immediately after consecration the very body of our Lord and his very blood, together with his soul and his Godhead, exist under the appearance of the bread and wine;* the body under the appearance of the bread, and the blood under the appearance of the wine, by virtue of the words used; but yet at the same time the body under the appearance of the wine, and the blood under the appearance of the bread, and the soul under both, by virtue of that natural connexion and concomitance, by which the parts of the Lord Christ who is risen from the dead henceforth no more to die, are united together; moreover his Godhead also, an account of its wonderful

personal union with the body and soul. Wherefore it is most true, that as much is contained under either appearance as under both: for *Christ whole and entire exists under the appearance of the bread, and under every part of that appearance, and likewise under the appearance of the wine, and under its parts.*"—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xiii. *Decr. de sanctiss. Euchar. Sacram. c.* iii.

"Considering, then, that Christ our Redeemer declared that which He offered * under the appearance of

---

* The idolatrous practice of the adoration of the Host is nothing more than a legitimate consequence from these premises, if true; and is accordingly enjoined by the Council of Trent in the most explicit terms. *Ex. gr.* "There is consequently no room left to doubt that all Christ's faithful people should, according to the custom always received in the Catholic Church, reverently pay to this most holy sacrament the worship of adoration [*Latria*] which is due to the true God. For it is not the less to be adored because it was instituted by Christ the Lord in order that it should be taken: for we believe that very same God to be present in it, whom the Eternal Father bringing into the world, saith: 'And let all the angels of God worship him,' the same whom the Magi fell down and worshipped, the same whom Scripture testifies to have been worshipped in Galilee by his Apostles."—*Concil. Trident. loc. cit. c.* v.

"If any one shall say that Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist to be adored, even with the outward worship of adoration [*Latria*], and therefore neither to be worshipped with peculiar festive solemnity, nor to be carried about solemnly in processions, according to the laudable and universal rite and custom of the Church, nor publicly held up to the people for adoration, and that those who adore it are idolaters: let him be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xiii. *De sacros. Euchar. Sacram. can.* vi.

bread, to be truly his body, it has ever been the persuasion held in the Church of God, and this holy synod now anew declares, that *by the consecration of the bread and wine* there is produced *a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of wine into the substance of his blood;* which conversion has been suitably and properly called transubstantiation by the holy Catholic Church."*—*Ibid. c.* iv.

"If any one shall say, that in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist there remains the substance of bread and wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny *that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of bread into body, and of the whole substance of wine into blood,* there remaining

---

* We read indeed "that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, *took* bread, and when he had *blessed* it, (Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22,) with *giving of thanks*, (Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24,) he *brake* it, and *gave* it to his disciples, saying 'Take, eat, this is my body,' &c.: but we read no where that he "*offered*" that bread in sacrifice to God, as the Tridentine Fathers affirm with their characteristic assurance. This is only one of the many instances in which the "authorized statements" of the Roman Church lay down premises directly at variance with the testimony of Scripture, in a manner which would lead men to suppose that the facts alleged by them are plainly stated in God's word. Will you, sir, who have ascertained these "authorized statements" to be in accordance with Scripture, undertake to justify the above representation of what was done by our Lord at the institution of his holy Supper? You will not, I am sure, think that the customary curse appended to the two first canons on the sacrifice of the Mass,

only the appearance of bread and wine, which conversion the Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation: let him be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xiii. *De sacros. Euchar. Sacram. can.* ii.

"If any one shall deny, that in the adorable sacrament of the Eucharist *whole Christ is contained under either appearance, and under every particle of either*, upon separation made; let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* iii.

"If any one shall say, that the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is not in the wonderful sacrament of the Eucharist *after consecration made*, but only *in the use of it* while it is taken, but not before, nor after; and that in *consecrated hosts, or particles of hosts, which are reserved or remain* after communion, there does not remain the very body of the Lord: let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* iv.

---

which I shall presently have occasion to quote, (see below, p. 52,) amounts to a scriptural demonstration of the assertion here made; though to the author of the Tridentine Catechism that method of proving a doctrine appears to have been "thoroughly satisfactory," for, "concerning the institution of this sacrifice," say they, "the holy synod of Trent has left no room for doubt: for *it has declared it to have been instituted by Christ the Lord at the last Supper, and has at the same time condemned with a curse* all those who assert that there is not offered to God a true and proper sacrifice, or that the offering is nothing more, than that Christ is given us to eat."—*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars* ii. *De Euchar. Sacram.* § 80. This is indeed conclusive! If the holy synod of Trent "*declares*" a thing to be so, and "*curses*" those who doubt or deny it, the truth of the matter is past all doubt. Is this what you call "thoroughly satisfactory?"

"If any one shall deny, that Christ, the fountain and author of all gifts of grace, *is taken whole and entire under the one appearance of the bread*, because, as some falsely assert, he is not taken under both kinds, according to Christ's own institution: let him be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xxi. *De Commun. can.* iii.

"To the perfection of the Eucharist the consecration of the matter [of the sacrament] is sufficient; both [elements] cease not to be a sacrament, although preserved in a box. . . . . In the Eucharist, that which before consecration was bread and wine, is *after consecration truly the substance of the body and blood of the Lord.*"—*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars.* ii. *De Euchar. Sacram.* § 9.

"There are three most wonderful and astounding things, which the Catholic faith without doubt believes and confesses to be wrought in this sacrament *by the words of consecration*: the first, that *the very body of Christ*, the same which, born of the Virgin, sitteth in heaven on the right hand of the Father, *is contained in this sacrament:* the second, that there remains in it none of the substance of the elements, although nothing can be more strange and repugnant to the senses: the third, naturally to be concluded from the two former, although most plainly expressed in the words of consecration, that *the accidents* which are seen with the eyes, or perceived by the other senses, are *without any subject matter*, in a wonderful and inexplicable manner. All the accidents indeed of bread and wine may be seen; but they attach to no substance, but subsist of themselves; *the substance of bread and wine being so changed into the very body and blood of the Lord*, that they cease

altogether to be the substance of bread and wine."—*Ibid.* § 26.

Such is the doctrine of transubstantiation, for which not only no scriptural proof can be adduced, but the origin of which in the later ages of the Church can be historically traced: upon it rests the doctrine of "the Sacrifice of the Mass," pre-eminently calculated to meet the difficulties arising out of the doctrine of a progressive and defective justification. But the Roman Church shall again speak for herself, through "her own authorized statements:"—

"Because *in that divine sacrifice which is performed in the Mass, that same Christ is contained, and unbloodily immolated,* who on the altar of the cross did once bloodily offer himself, the holy synod teaches, that the said sacrifice is *truly propitiatory;* and its effect is, that if we approach God with a true heart and right faith, with fear and reverence, contrite and penitent, through that sacrifice we obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need. For the Lord, *appeased by the offering of the same, remits even great crimes and sins,* granting grace and the gift of repentance. For it is even *the same victim,* and *He the same, now offering* it through the ministration of priests, who then offered himself upon the cross; the method only of offering being different: and of that, the bloody, offering the fruits are most richly enjoyed by this unbloody offering; so little reason is there to say, that the former is in any way derogated from by the latter. Wherefore it is

rightly offered, according to the tradition of the Apostles,* not only *for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities of the living faithful, but also for the dead in Christ who are not yet fully purged."—Concil. Trident. Sess.* xxii. *Doctr. de Sacrif. Missæ. c.* ii.

"The holy synod could wish that in all Masses the faithful who are present, would communicate not only in spiritual affection, but by sacramental receiving of the Eucharist, so that a richer fruit might result to them from that most holy sacrifice. Yet if this be not always done, the holy synod does not on that account condemn those Masses, in which the priest alone sacramentally communicates, as private and unlawful; but approves and even commends them; forasmuch as *those Masses also must be held to be in truth common,* partly because in them the people spiritually communicate, and partly because *they are celebrated by the public Minister of the Church, not for himself alone, but for all the faithful* who belong to Christ's body.—*Ibid. c.* vi.

"Whereas the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has in holy councils, and recently in this œcumenical synod taught *from the holy Scriptures* and from the ancient tradition of the Fathers, that *there is a purgatory,* and that *the souls there detained are assisted* by the suffrages of the faithful, but especially *by the*

* Will you, or will those under whose auspices you have made your assertions, produce scriptural proof of this "Apostolic Tradition?" You owe the production of such evidence to your brethren of the Anglican Church, for whose *honest ignorance* on this point I can safely pledge myself. If you can make out your case, it will go far towards that re-union of the Roman and Anglican Churches, for which you so devoutly wish.

most acceptable sacrifice of the altar; the holy synod enjoins the bishops to use due diligence that *the sound doctrine of purgatory*, handed down from the Father-Saints and holy Councils, may by Christ's faithful people be believed, held, taught and preached everywhere. . . . . Let the bishops take care, that the suffrages of the living faithful, namely *the sacrifices of masses, prayers, almsdeeds, and other works of piety*, which have been accustomed to be performed by the faithful, for the departed faithful, may be *piously and devoutly performed according to the institutions of the Church.*"—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xxv. *Decr. de Purgat.*

"If any one shall say, that there is not, *in the Mass, offered to God a true and proper sacrifice,* or that the offering is nothing more than that Christ is given us to eat: let him be accursed."—*Concil. Trident. Sess.* xxiii. *De Sacrif. Missæ. can.* i.

"If any one shall say, that by these words 'Do this in remembrance of me,' Christ did not constitute his apostles priests, or not ordain, that *they and other priests should offer up his body and blood:* let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* ii.

"If any one shall say, that the sacrifice of the Mass is only one of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made upon the Cross, and not a *propitiatory sacrifice;* or that it is *of use only to him who receives it;* and that it ought not to be offered *for the quick and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities:* let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* iii.

"If any one shall say, that *Masses in which the priest alone sacramentally communicates,* are unlawful, and

therefore to be abolished: let him be accursed."—*Ibid. can.* viii.

"If any one shall say, that there is not, in the New Testament, a visible and outward priesthood; or that it does not consist in any power of *consecrating and offering up the very body and blood of the Lord,* and of remitting and retaining sins, but only the office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel; or that those who preach, are no priests at all: let him be accursed." —*Concil Trident. Sess.* xxiii. *De Sacram. ord. can.* i.

"That *by the Eucharist lighter sins, commonly called venial, are remitted and pardoned,* is not to be doubted. For whatever the soul has lost through the ardour of lust, slightly offending in some trifling matter, all that *the Eucharist restores, wiping off every such minor guilt.*"—*Catech. Concil. Trident. Pars* ii. *De Euchar. Sacram.* § 54.

"Above all, they shall teach that the Eucharist was instituted by Christ our Lord for two reasons: first, that it might be the heavenly food of our souls, whereby we might keep and preserve our spiritual life; secondly, that *the Church might have a perpetual sacrifice, whereby our sins might be expiated,* and our heavenly Father, often grievously offended by our transgressions, might be *turned from wrath to mercy, and from the severity of just chastisement to clemency.*"—*Ibid.* § 77.

"Inasmuch as the Eucharist is a sacrifice, it contains in itself *efficacy not only to gain merit, but to make satisfaction.* For as Christ the Lord in his passion obtained merit, and made satisfaction for us; so *they who offer this sacrifice,* whereby they communicate with us, *merit the fruits of the Lord's passion, and make satisfaction.*" —*Ibid.* § 79.

"Therefore if with pure heart, and fervent faith, and under a sense of deep sorrow for our sins, *we immolate and offer up this most holy victim*, we obtain, without doubt, mercy from the Lord, and grace to help in time of need. For *with the savour of that victim God is so well pleased, that*, imputing to us the gift of grace and repentance, *he pardons our sins.* Whence also that solemn prayer of the Church. As often as the commemoration of this sacrifice is celebrated, the whole work of our salvation is set in motion; *for the rich fruits of that bloody victim flow towards us through this unbloody sacrifice.*"—*Ibid.* § 86.

"Such is the efficacy of this sacrifice, that *it benefits not only him who offers, and him who takes it, but all the faithful*, whether they be alive with us on the earth, or whether already *dead in the Lord, and not yet fully reconciled* [*expiated*]. For by the most certain tradition from the Apostles, it is *no less usefully offered for them, than for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and all other calamities and distresses of the living.*"—*Ibid.* § 87.

After the evidence thus adduced, I am sure that you will not deny the fact, that the sinner's justification is not, according to the authorized doctrine of the Roman Church, founded upon that, whereon I have shown at the commencement of this Letter, that Holy Scripture invariably rests it, *faith in the all-sufficient sacrifice of the Son of God.*

In the Roman Church the sinner is never permitted to lift up his eyes directly to the Cross of

Christ, to believe and to be saved: no sooner has he, according to her system, appropriated the merit of Christ's death by the initiatory sacrament of Baptism, than a new necessity of reconciliation arises. Expiation follows after expiation; his life is spent in the "laborious baptism" of penance; his hope of life eternal is made the subject of the most precarious and transient promises held out to him by a fellow-sinner, to whom he is forced under pain of eternal death to reveal the inmost secrets of his heart; his trials and afflictions are not to him proofs of a Father's chastening love and correcting hand, but opportunities of appeasing by his sufferings the wrath of that God, whom the sacrifice of the "Lamb without spot" has failed entirely to reconcile; his labours are not the labours, his devotions not the devotions, of love; they are acts of compensation to God, extorted from him by the terrors of unexpiated guilt.

In the last moments of his life, the Roman Church suffers not the poor bond-servant of a law of ordinances, to rest his hope upon that rock of salvation, the Crucified Saviour; she offers him the delusive comfort of expiating the venial sins which may happen to remain uncancelled on his life's account, by the pseudo-sacrament of Extreme Unction; amidst the dark-

ness with which she surrounds his soul on its departure from the earthly tabernacle, she presents to his view the prospect of an indefinite period of torment for the complete expiation of his sins; and farther mocks him by holding out an uncertain chance of earlier escape by virtue of his share in the superabundant good works laid up in the Church's treasury, and in the benefit of the propitiatory Masses which are offered for the souls of the departed faithful.

Will you be bold enough to deny that this is the outline of the Christian course, presented in the "authorized statements" of the Roman Church? Will you be bold enough to assert, that such is the condition which the Apostle describes, when he saith, that "being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom also we have access by faith into this grace, wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God?" Does not the Roman Church, on the contrary, describe, and too truly, the condition of her worshippers, as that of men who are undergoing a perpetual and laborious process of justification by sacraments, works, and sufferings; who ever seek, and never attain, peace with God through successive expiations; who pursue through life the ever-receding shadow of that state of grace in

which they can never make good their standing; and advance towards death with trembling step, in fear of the fire of purgatory?

This, if words have any meaning, is the doctrine of the Roman Church on the subject of man's justification; and to that doctrine, God's holy Word is plainly and diametrically opposed. The very name of "the gospel of peace, the glad tidings of good things," gives the lie to the appalling and blasphemous superstition which Rome inculcates, and which our Church, "earnestly contending for the faith once delivered to the saints," indignantly repudiates, as a system utterly irreconcilable with that word of God which testifieth, that we "have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father."

You cannot be ignorant, that in exposing the unsoundness of Rome on this fundamental point of justification, I have been compelled both to pass over many passages strikingly illustrative of this her leading error, in which her authorized statements abound, and to refrain altogether from following up a variety of heretical positions to which she stands committed, and which branch out, as from a centre, from her false and unscriptural view of justification. But, though forced to omit much, I have, I trust, adduced

more than enough to disprove your assumption that the Roman Church is orthodox.

Therewith I must for the present rest content; and reserve for my next the refutation of the other assumptions in her favour, to which, at the opening of the present Letter, I have directed your attention.

Meanwhile, I remain,
Your faithful brother in the Lord,
G. E. B.

Coombe Wood,
February 11, 1842.

Maurice and Co., Printers, Fenchurch street.

Price 1*s*. 6*d*. *each*, LETTERS I. AND II. OF

CATHOLICITY v. SIBTHORP;

Or, Some Help to answer the question, whether the REV. R. W. SIBTHORP, B.D. is now or ever was a Catholic?

In a series of Letters addressed to him by the REV. G. E. BIBER, LL.D., Presbyter of the Anglo-Catholic Church.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

1 *Vol.* 8*vo*. *Price* 14*s*.,

THE STANDARD OF CATHOLICITY,

Or an Attempt to point out in a plain Manner certain safe and leading Principles, amidst the conflicting Opinions by which the Church is at present agitated.

Price 1*s*.

OUR DAY OF SIFTING:

A plain SERMON for these perplexing Times, preached on New Year's Day 1842, at St. Andrew's Church, Ham.

Also, Price 1*s*.,

THE LORD'S HOUSE:

A SERMON, preached on Sunday Evening, October 24th, 1841, at the *Chapel of Ease, Robinhood Hamlet*, in aid of the Funds now collecting for the Endowment of the said Chapel.

Published by Request, in aid of the Endowment Fund.

Also, Price 1*s*. 6*d*.,

THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

RECOMMENDED TO THE YOUNG,

IN A LETTER ADDRESSED TO HIS PUPILS.

And, Price 1*s*. 6*d*.,

GOD'S HOLY PRESENCE

A LETTER ADDRESSED TO HIS PUPILS.

CATHOLICITY v. SIBTHORP;

OR,

SOME HELP TO ANSWER THE QUESTION,

WHETHER

THE REV. R. W. SIBTHORP, B.D.

IS NOW OR EVER WAS

A CATHOLIC?

IN A SERIES OF LETTERS ADDRESSED TO HIM

BY

THE REV. G. E. BIBER, LL.D.

Presbyter of the Anglo-Catholic Church.

Letter the Fourth.

LONDON:

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD; AND

WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;

AND JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

1842.

LONDON:
Printed by Maurice and Co., Fenchurch Street.

TO

THE REV R. W. SIBTHORP.

SIR,

In exposing the complication of errors with which the Roman Church, in her authorized statements, has obscured the doctrine of man's justification, I was inevitably led to such a length of discussion as compelled me to bring my last Letter abruptly to a conclusion. I now resume the course of my argument, as laid down at the beginning of that letter, and proceed in the first place to examine what are those fruits of holiness by which, in your assumption, the Roman Church is so eminently characterized.

Considering what has incidentally come out, while examining her doctrine of justification, respecting the spirit in which the Roman Church teaches her members to approach God, and the motives from which their devotions and services must flow according to the scheme propounded

by her as the way of salvation, I might almost hold myself absolved from the necessity of scrutinizing those "glowing daily devotions" and "hourly offices," those "symbolic rites," that "inestimable practice of confession with its attendant sacramental privileges," that "soul-engrossing intercourse with the spirits of the just made perfect," that "pious recognition of the less perfect departed faithful, whose purification for bliss is still proceeding," that "inseparable connexion with the glorious company of the Apostles, the noble army of martyrs, the admirable band of confessors," that "apparent devotedness to religious duties," that "fervency as well as punctuality of devotion," which have won your undiscriminating applause, and led you to imagine that the Roman Church, and she alone, presents a fair field for the exercise of deep and earnest piety. What, let me ask, are the "glowing, punctual, daily, and hourly devotions" of which you speak? They are not the adoration of praise and thanksgiving offered in the spirit of freedom and adoption to a God of love by those whom He hath reconciled to himself by Jesus Christ; they are the laborious endeavours of men groaning under the weight of unexpiated sin, to diminish that weight, and to reduce the amount of expiatory punishment to be endured by them, here or hereafter: they are not the joyful exercise of the privilege of sons,

but the painful performance of acts due from trembling criminals to an offended God: they are devoid of two essential characteristics of true devotion, love and humility; for they proceed from fear of that punishment which they are supposed to avert; and they are presumptuously intended to effect that appeasing of God's wrath, and that expiation of sin, for which God himself has appointed the blood of the immaculate Lamb as the only and all-sufficient propitiation. Again, what are the "symbolic rites," and "sacramental privileges," upon which you set so much value? They are not the outward and visible means by which God according to his own appointment invisibly works in us, perfecting his strength in our weakness; but methods of expiation to which an inherent power of delivering from guilt and punishment is superstitiously attributed: they are not opportunities of enjoying the sweetness of communion with God by virtue of the free access which He has given us unto himself through Christ; but means of gaining access to a distant, alienated God, who may not, without the intervention of expiatory ordinances, be approached. Or, what is that "inestimable practice of confession" which you so much admire? It is not the ministration of ghostly counsel to the troubled conscience, of merited rebuke to the careless, or of needful consolation to the contrite

sinner, by virtue of the authority of binding and loosing committed by Christ to his Apostles and their successors; it is a citation of the sinner's conscience before the tribunal of his fallible fellow-sinner, an adjudication upon the merits and demerits of his case, an infliction of punishment proportionate to his guilt, by virtue of the power, which by a blasphemous fiction the Roman Church claims for her priests, to determine the measure of expiatory suffering or performance, to which the sinner shall submit, and with which God shall be satisfied. Again, let me ask, wherein consists the "inseparable connexion with the glorious company of the Apostles, the noble army of martyrs, the admirable band of confessors," the "soul-engrossing intercourse with the spirits of the just made perfect," which you so vauntingly adduce as an evidence that the Roman Church has her conversation in heaven? Not in glorifying God for so much of his spiritual building already accomplished, not in giving Him thanks for so great a cloud of witnesses encouraging us to follow their blessed examples, not in uniting the voice of the Church militant in earth with that of the Church triumphant in heaven in one common adoration; not, at least not chiefly, in any of these, but mainly, and almost exclusively, in attributing to departed saints and martyrs a power of intercession, available for obtaining a partial remission of the

punishment to be endured by sinners not yet fully reconciled, whether on earth, or in purgatory, and so exalting them to a participation in the dignity of the mediatorial office, which belongs to Christ alone. Or, lastly, what means that "pious recognition of the less perfect departed faithful, whose purification for bliss is still proceeding?" What else, but the profane presumption of assisting by the "suffrages" of living sinners,—that is to say, by expiatory endurances or performances undertaken by themselves, or procured from the Church by adequate compensation,—souls which it is blasphemously alleged that Christ has failed perfectly to justify by his death for them, or to sanctify by his life in them, whose expiation and purification consequently remain to be accomplished by purgatorial fire?

You will hardly venture to deny, after the evidence I have adduced in my last Letter, that such is of necessity the character of the devotional practices and acts of piety which have allured you to the Roman Church, or, to use her own explicit language, of the *works of satisfaction* into which her whole system of worship resolves itself. It is no part of my argument to assert, that genuine piety may not exist in the hearts of individual members of her communion: I acknowledge, joyfully, my hope and belief, that in many cases the unspeakable mercy

of God may, by the effectual inward operation of his grace, overrule the errors and superstitions of the Tridentine system, and enable professed members of the Church of Rome to approach God in reliance upon Christ's merit alone, to commune with Him in the spirit of freedom and of love, and under the influence of such communion to bring forth fruits of real, practical holiness. But it is not to such cases as these that we must look, when we are concerned to ascertain the character of the Roman Church by her fruits; for they are not really *her* fruits, but the fruits of the wonderful grace of God, brought forth in spite of her withering influence.

However freely the Roman Church may bestow her curses upon those who follow out her corrupt system into its legitimate consequences, she will never be enabled, by her copious anathemas, to turn the bondage of her expiatory service into the freedom of holy worship, the penal power of her priesthood into a ministry of reconciliation, or the fear of purgatory into a hope of glory. The results which upon every principle of sound reasoning must be anticipated from the system set forth in her authorized statements, actually do follow from it, wherever there is free scope for its developement; and nothing can be more fallacious than the excuse so often repeated by her advocates, that the corruptions, the existence

of which they cannot deny, are practical abuses, which are not only not essential, but rather contrary, to her theory and constitution.

In support of this view, and to prevent your objecting to it as merely inferential, I will now draw your attention to certain evidence of fact, which the Roman Church herself has furnished, and which indisputably shows what those fruits of holiness are, upon which she more particularly prides herself. You will admit, that if the Roman Church has upon careful inquiry ascertained, that certain individuals were possessed of so high a degree of holiness, as to warrant her "Supreme Head" in solemnly "enrolling them among Christ's saints," and "enjoining the universal Church devoutly to worship their memory yearly upon their natal day,"* the account which is published of their virtues by the Roman Church herself, under the sanction of her rulers,† must afford a fair criterion of the practical fruits of her system.

* *Lives of* St. Alphonsus Liguori, St. Francis di Girolamo, St. John Joseph of the Cross, St. Pacificus of San Severino, *and* St. Veronica Giuliani, *whose Canonization took place on Trinity Sunday, May 26th,* 1839.—Introd. p. vii. and xviii.

† In the first place the "*Lives*" above referred to were put forth by the publisher of "The Rev. Dr. Wiseman" among his own works, though his name did not appear on the title-page. The "Bishop of Melipotamus" has since given a more accurate account of his connexion with the

Let us see what is, upon evidence so unquestionable, the character of devotion as practised by the Saints of the Roman Church:

"He [Alphonsus] went to offer up *his devotions to the Blessed Sacrament* in the church where it was exposed, and remained there for several hours, until it had been replaced in the tabernacle."—*Lives of the Saints*, p. 7.

"He ordained that *the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament*, with the recital of devout prayers in honour

---

book in question, to the following effect: "I have only to say, that it is the work of a younger hand, the first fruits, I trust, of much good to be done by it for God's Church; the effusion of a younger heart, worthier than mine to enter into the thoughts and feelings of the Saints. But *it was written at my suggestion; and I have no desire to shrink from any thing in it.*"—Remarks on a Letter from the Rev. W. Palmer, M. A. *of Worcester College, Oxford;* by N. Wiseman, D. D., *Bishop of Melipotamus.* Lond. 1841, p. 69.—That Dr. Wiseman does not shrink from any thing in the said book, will not excite much surprise; but I now ask you, sir, who can hardly yet have attained to that wonderful gift, the *frons perfricta* of Roman controversialists, to read that book attentively, remembering that the persons of whose lives it gives an account, are, upon the grounds therein stated, to be relied on by you as powerful intercessors with God for the salvation of your soul, and invoked by you for that purpose, in obedience to the holy Roman Church, of which you profess to be a dutiful son; and when, bearing this in mind, you shall have read through the book, I ask you to lay your hand upon your heart, and answer to yourself, whether you have "no desire to shrink from any thing in it?"

of our Lord present in it, should take place every evening."—*Ibid.* p. 35.

"With equal energy did he, by his writings and sermons and still more by his example, labour to enkindle in the hearts of all, a fervent *faith and devotion towards our Lord in the blessed Sacrament.* Sometimes, as if in his transports of love he beheld Jesus with the eyes of the body, he would exclaim, '*Look at him, see how beautiful he is; love him!*'"—*Ibid.* p. 45.

"He preached also with extraordinary fervour on the *devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus*, the office of which he procured leave to introduce into his diocese."—*Ibid.* p. 46.

"So completely was he [Pacificus] absorbed in awe and veneration, when he stood in the presence of *our sweet Lord in the blessed Eucharist*, that in spite of the ulcers in his legs, he was accustomed to fall upon his knees whenever he passed before *the altar whereon He reposed;* and would remain still and motionless, heedless of the gnats which, with their sharp stings, annoyed him in summer."—*Ibid.* p. 185.

"In order not to interrupt his union with God, he always *recited the rosary* while passing through the streets or along the cloisters; and one of his brethren, whose cell was near his, hearing him *repeat the Our Father aloud during the greater part of the night*, advised him to take some rest, but he answered, "We must not caress the body;" and so saying, he went on with his prayer."—*Ibid.* p. 192.

These few extracts will be sufficient to show, of what character is the worship offered by the Saints

of the Roman Church professedly to Him to whom worship is due: whether it be that worship in spirit and in truth which He desires to be paid him, may well be doubted. But turn we now to another worship, which from the constant reference made, and the wonderful effects attributed to it, is not, certainly, in the estimation of the Roman Saints, inferior in importance to the worship of the Most High. It may fitly be introduced by the assurance given to grievous sinners in the confessional, at the recommendation of Alphonsus, a Roman Bishop and Standard Divine,

"that amendment is not impossible, if they would have recourse to *the grace of God and the patronage of the blessed Virgin.*"—*Lives of the Saints*, p. 23.

The following edifying descriptions will show the means by which the worship designed to secure that patronage is promoted, and the light in which it is regarded, in the Roman Church:—

"Whilst he [Alphonsus] was preaching on the patronage of the blessed Virgin, and exciting his hearers to *recur with confidence to her, in all their wants*, he suddenly exclaimed, 'O, you are too cold *in praying to our Blessed Lady!* I will pray to her for you.' He knelt down in the attitude of prayer, with his eyes raised to heaven, and was seen by all present *lifted more than a foot from the ground*, and turned *towards a statue of the Blessed Virgin*, near the pulpit. *The countenance of Our Lady* [the statue?] *darted forth beams of light*, which shone upon the face of the ecstatic

Alphonsus. This spectacle lasted about five or six minutes, during which the people cried out, 'Mercy, mercy! a miracle, a miracle!' and every one burst into a flood of tears. But the saint rising up, exclaimed in a loud voice, 'Be glad, for *the Blessed Virgin has granted your prayer.*'"—*Ibid.* p. 27.

"One evening, whilst he was preaching . . . . . upon the patronage of the Blessed Virgin, he was on a sudden rapt in ecstacy, and his countenance shone with such splendour, that the whole church was lighted up with unusual brightness, and he exclaimed, 'See, the Blessed Virgin is come to dispense graces amongst us; *let us pray to her, and we shall obtain whatever we ask.*"—*Ibid.* p. 36.

"He declared the Blessed Virgin the protectress of his order, and sought to encourage *devotion to her, as a powerful means of obtaining divine grace.* 'The reformers,' said he, 'represent the devotion of Mary as injurious to God, denying her power, and impugning *her potent intercession;* but it is our duty to show, for the profit of our hearers, *how powerful she is with God, and how pleasing it is to Him to see her honoured.*' These feelings of devotion to her he has embodied in his '*Glories of Mary,*' which has made known to England, and other countries, the filial tenderness and love which he cherished towards *our holy Mother.*"—*Ibid.* p. 46.

"He [Francis] was *tenderly devoted to Our blessed Lady.* For twenty-two years he preached a sermon in her praise and honour every week. To youth especially it was his custom to recommend this devotion *as the surest preservative of innocence, and the best remedy after sin;* saying that *one could hardly be saved who felt no*

devotion towards the Mother of God. Mary was *his counsellor in doubt, his comfort in toil, his strength in all his enterprises, his refuge in danger and distress.* He experienced an inexpressible delight, whenever he *recited the rosary of our tender Mother.*"—*Ibid.* p. 101.

" Fixing his eyes [on his death-bed] upon a devout image of Our Lady, ' Ah! Mary,' said he, ' my dearest Mother, thou hast ever cherished me like a loving parent, though I have been thy too, too unworthy child. *Complete now the measure of thy mercies* in my regard, *by obtaining for me the love of thy divine Son.*' "—*Ibid.* p. 107.

" Next to God, he [Pacificus] entertained a most tender devotion to *Our blessed Lady, the Queen of Heaven,* to whom he had recourse *in all the necessities of his soul.* . . . . He fasted rigorously on the vigils of her festivals; and on these days *his countenance, usually wan and pallid, became fresh and florid, remaining so until the following day.*"—*Ibid.* p. 187.

" He [the same Pacificus, when on the point to die,] rose from his bed, and placing himself devoutly on his knees, recited three *Ave Marias,* saying at the end, with singular earnestness, ' Let these be, O my God, *in satisfaction for my sins.*' "—*Ibid.* p. 216.

Passing over the various instances of the worship paid to Saints and their relics by these holy aspirants to canonization, and consequently to a share in that intrusion upon Christ's mediatorial office, of which we shall presently have abundant and most offensive proof,—I now proceed to adduce some highly characteristic evidences of the

nature of those virtues which constitute Roman sanctity. The following are proofs of eminent chastity and purity of heart :—

" It was in his vigilant guard over chastity that our saint [John Joseph] was most singular. *His unremitting mortifications,* his extreme modesty and perpetual watchfulness over all his senses, *preserved him from the slightest breath of contamination.* Never during the sixty years of his life was he known to *look any one not of his own sex in the face.* . . . So habitual and so jealous was his love of this virtue, that on his death-bed, when one of the brothers raised the covering from his limbs, in order to dress the ulcers upon his legs, the dying saint made an effort to draw it down again. In reward for *this virginal purity,* which he preserved unspotted from his baptism, as his confessor afterwards attested, God caused his person, in spite of his age, infirmities, and constant sores, to diffuse *a sweet and delicious perfume,* that was perceived by all around him."—*Lives of the Saints,* pp. 144, 145.

A similar story is told of Pacificus :—

" Surpassing and wonderful, in like manner, was *his pure, virginal chastity;* for he never would permit any one to see any part of his body uncovered, or even to dress his ulcers, save once or twice. . . . With the same jealousy, he kept *a guard over his eyes,* through which evil thoughts so often enter the mind. When he walked in the streets or in the cloisters, he *drew his hood down over his face,* in such a way, that *some of his brethren could never see the colour of his eyes;* and for the same reason, he would never converse with strangers, or even

his own sister, for more than a few seconds. . . . . God gave a manifest proof how agreeable to Him was *the purity of his servant;* for his cell, his habit, the bandages wherewith he bound his sores, and, after his death, his body, *breathed a celestial fragrance.*"—*Ibid.* p. 203.

No less wonderful and satisfactory is the following evidence of the eminent degree in which Pacificus possessed that most excellent of all Christian virtues, charity:—

"The fire of heavenly charity produced *a physical effect* upon him—shooting *sparkles of real light* from his eyes; and so great was *the warmth excited in his body,* that he never approached the fire in the coldest winters, but *kept his window open to moderate the heat which inwardly burned within his breast.*"—*Ibid.* p. 192.

The following picture of the manner in which the Lord's day was usually employed by St. Francis di Girolamo, may serve as an epitome of the perfection of ministerial usefulness in the Roman Church:—

"When the Sunday came, he first spent two hours in mental prayer, after which *he scourged himself long and severely* with the discipline, (a practice he observed daily at the hour of rising,) then *said Mass,* and afterwards *recited the canonical hours,* bare-headed and kneeling, either in the middle of his room, or *before the blessed Sacrament.* His private devotions being *satisfied,* he spent the rest of the morning in *the confessional,* or with his congregation. The time of dinner and recreation followed; and the latter he for the most

part spent in spiritual entertainment with his Beloved, from which he was summoned to discourse for the space of an hour concerning the Passion of our Lord, and to meditate thereupon. At the appointed hour the saint and his companions issued into the streets, walked in procession, and then, distributing themselves in divers parts, began to preach to the people. Francis usually mounted *a stage, near or opposite to the dancers and mountebanks,* who either slunk away at his approach, or vainly strove, through rage and spite, to distract the attention of the audience, who were fascinated by his eloquence. After the discourse, *on his knees at the foot of the cross he scourged his shoulders with the discipline,* and then once more betook himself to *the confessional,* where he remained till the doors of the church were closed."—*Lives of the Saints,* p. 72.

A different kind of ministerial perfection is presented in the following episode from the life of St. John Joseph of the Cross :—

" Carried onward by an ardent love of the cross, whose treasures he more and more discovered as he advanced in the dignity and functions of the sacred ministry, he resolved to establish in the wood adjoining his convent *a kind of solitude,* where, after the manner of the ancient Fathers of the Desert, he might *devote himself entirely to prayer and penitential austerities,* and give to the Church *an illustrious and profitable example of the sacerdotal spirit exercised in a perfect degree.* God blessed the holy undertaking with exceeding fruit, and turned in its favour the hearts of all near and afar off. There was found in the wood a pleasant fountain, whose waters healed the sick ; and

hard by he erected a little church, and round about, at intervals, five small hermitages, wherein, with his companions, he *renewed the austere and exalted life of the old anchorites, and advanced greatly in spirituality.* And in order that no care or worldly thought might ruffle *the sublime tranquillity of their contemplative life,* the convent had charge of daily supplying the holy solitary with food."—*Ibid.* p. 125.

Our attention is next due to the means by which such exalted piety and virtue is attained by the Saints of the Roman Church. These are chiefly the mortifications or penitential works of satisfaction which they impose upon themselves, or undertake under the direction of their confessors, and by which they gain, according to the Tridentine doctrine, such merit, as thereby not only to expiate their own sins, and entitle themselves to a heavenly reward, but to enable them to communicate of their abundance to their less perfect, and, in the matter of merit, more needy brethren. These meritorious works of penance consist in extraordinary acts of abstinence, carried, we are told, by one Saint so far as to abstain for the space of thirty years from every liquid whatsoever, (*Lives of the Saints*, p. 148) ;—in the use of miserable and loathsome food, such as bread requiring from its hardness to be pounded in a mortar, (p. 15), or exposed for a week before to the scorching heat of the sun, (p. 181),

food mixed with ashes, (pp. 176, 207), or sprinkled with wormwood and other bitter herbs, (pp. 15, 31), putrid meat, (p. 208);—in the adoption of inconvenient and painful postures in eating, (p. 15), or during sleep, (pp. 148, 180);—in walking bare-foot, or on the bare knees, (pp. 181, 227), over thorns and sharp stones, (p. 208);—in licking the floor with the tongue, (p. 15), or kissing some filthy spot, (p. 227);—in copious flagellations, both in private and in public, with ropes, (pp. 24, 208), with chains, (p. 208), with thistles, (p. 227), with the regular discipline, (pp. 15, 20, 31, 147, 208, 227, &c. &c.);—in wearing rough hair-shirts and iron chains upon the bare body, (pp. 20, 147, 208), iron crosses studded with sharp nails on the breast and shoulders, (p. 148), and iron nails between the feet and sandals, (p. 147.)

In many cases these mortifications and torments are purely self-inflicted; in other cases they form part of the rule of some religious order; and at other times they are directed by confessors and other spiritual superiors, either by way of penance, or for the exercise of that most exalted virtue of the Roman Church,—canonical obedience. The power of that virtue over the mind and body of the Saints is variously illustrated; it compels acceptance of a bishopric, or any other post of duty, by unwilling hands, (*Lives of the Saints*, pp. 28,

68);—it suspends the infliction of mortifications, (p. 43), or the use of prayer and the sacraments, (pp. 108, 206);—it enables a deaf man to hear, (p. 205), recals a man in ecstacy to his natural position, (p. 185);—and even regulates the hour and the moment of death, (pp. 218, 270, 271.)

One of the severest trials to which the faith of a Saint can be subjected, is a conflict between the direct commands of God, and the commands of the Superiors; as in the following case:—

"One of the commands given to Veronica, after her espousals [see below, p. 24, note], was that she should increase her fasting; and about a year after that event, she received *a direct injunction from God* to fast for three whole years, upon nothing but bread and water. But Almighty God, *wishing at the same time to put her obedience to her Superiors to the test, caused them all to refuse her their permission,* without which she could not put the Divine command in practice. And although *He continued to repeat His command, and even to reproach her for not fulfilling it;* and although her stomach rejected every other food but bread, yet *her Superiors obstinately refused* to accede to her petition. 'I was full of joy,' she says, 'because in this way I suffered much; but I felt that the flesh could bear no more.' At length, after she had undergone *the severest torments,* from *the refusal of her Superiors,* the weakness of her body, *and her sorrow of mind at not being able to comply with the will of God,* from March to September, God was pleased to support her by milk miraculously supplied."—*Lives of the Saints,* p. 257.

To complete our view of the virtues which pass for notes of holiness in the Roman Church, it now only remains to produce evidence of the presumptuous spirit in which all these works of satisfaction and supererogation are performed.* In founding the order of Redemptorists, we read that Alphonsus

"made a moving discourse to his companions, in which he besought them, as followers of Jesus Christ, to imitate His perfect Holocaust to His Eternal Father, and to *offer themselves in sacrifice to Him for the salvation of souls*, by promising an *exact observance of the rules* proposed."—*Lives of the Saints*, p. 18.

* If the following anecdotes be founded upon fact, it would appear as if even in the midst of that "strong delusion" in which the votaries of Rome are held captive, God had not left himself altogether without a witness in their consciences. Of St. John Joseph of the Cross we read that, "his spiritual enemy now threw another element of bitterness and trial into the cup of tribulation. This was *an apprehension that the glory of God was nowise forwarded by the austerities* he practised himself, or recommended to those he directed, but rather that *they were prompted by an illusive spirit.*"—*Lives of the Saints*, p. 133.—And St. Veronica Giuliani, the self-constituted "mediatrix between God and sinners," describing a similar state of mind, says of herself: "The demon tempted me, and I seemed to hear a dreadful voice, which continually repeated, "*See, these are the fruits of praying for sinners. All their sins are crowding upon thy head. Do good now, if thou canst.*"—*Ibid.* p. 259.—How great must be the darkness of that soul in which the misgivings of conscience are accounted suggestions of the Evil One!

In accordance with this purpose of their institution we read, that

"the bell was ordered to be rung in all their houses, every evening, to call the inmates to recite the psalm *De profundis*, for *the souls in purgatory*, whom the Saint, during the whole of his life, *sought to relieve by prayers, indulgences, and mortifications*, and especially by *offering up the holy sacrifice of the Mass for them.*" —*Ibid.* p. 49.

Another of these Saints, Francis, when on his death-bed, thus consoles the sorrowing bystanders :—

"Weep not: I go to heaven, where I shall remember you, and be *better able to assist you.*"—*Ibid. p.* 108.

Of a third Saint, Joseph, it is recorded, that

"his charity even went so far, that he prayed God to *transfer the sufferings of others to himself.* And such was *the force of his charity*, that the petition was not unfrequently heard."—*Ibid.* p. 141.

And again, that in compassion to the frailty of one of his penitents, he

"enjoined him an easy penance, *undertaking to perform the remainder of the satisfaction himself.*"—*Ibid.* p. 142.

Of Pacificus it is said, that

"his heart did burn with the desire of *freeing the souls* who are afflicted in purgatory, *from their most cruel and bitter torments.* . . . . he cheerfully *took upon himself to satisfy, both by prayer and mortification, some*

portion of the punishment, which the souls of the members of the suffering Church are doomed to undergo. He offered up *fervent prayers in their behalf,* and every day *recited for them the whole of the office for the dead;* adding thereto *corporal sufferings,* through the vehemence of his desire to see them *freed from their torments,* and united to the beatific vision and enjoyment of God."—*Ibid.* p. 201.

Nothing, however, can exceed the direct blasphemy with which the most holy Passion of the Redeemer is mimicked throughout the account given of "the passion" of Veronica, which presents a singular and most painful combination of will-worship, fanatical delusion, and imposture. The subject is thus introduced:—

"We must now pass to the sublime novitiate and preparation of grace, by which she became, during the last thirty-five years of her life, *an exact image of Our crucified Lord.* In the year 1693, she beheld, in a vision, a mysterious chalice or cup, which she knew to be *the presage of the Divine passion, whereof she was to be a perfect copy.* . . . . . Her spirit was ready to quaff it to the bottom, but the flesh shuddered and drew back, *as did Our Lord's in the garden;* but she subdued it by severe mortifications."—*Ibid.* pp. 241, 242.

The account then proceeds to detail certain visions:—

"He gave me to behold His most sacred humanity, as it was during the scourging at the pillar. As my Saviour stood thus weltering in blood, and covered with wounds, he presented the chalice. . . . Our Lord ap-

peared to me, with a large crown of thorns upon His head. . . . . The pain I suffered was so excessive, that I have never, as far as I can understand, suffered any thing like it. . . . He wished me to share in all His torments, that I might be called *the spouse of God crucified*, and therefore, *I also was to be crucified with my divine spouse.** . . . . . This pain inspired me with *such compassion for sinners*, that offering to the Eternal Father all the sufferings of Jesus, and all his merits *with those of Our Lady* for the conversion of sinners, I prayed more earnestly than ever for sufferings, telling God that *I wished to be mediatrix between Him and sinners.*"—*Ibid.* pp. 244, 246, 247.

Then follows a description of her wounds, some inflicted by herself, others miraculous. With the blood that flowed from the former, she wrote, *inter alia*, as follows:—

"I intend at this moment to confirm all the protestations which I have made *with my own blood*, and anew *I make myself the mediatrix between you* [Jesus] *and sinners.*"—*Ibid.* p. 260.

---

* It forms no part of my present argument, nor will the limits of this Letter permit me, to enter upon the account given of the "divine espousals" of Veronica. As an authentic, documentary, proof of the incredible length to which the Roman Church carries her blasphemies and absurdities, it is well worth perusal; and I have accordingly extracted it, for the benefit of those who are not likely to have recourse to the original, in another place, where I have also given a selection from the lying signs and wonders attributed to these Saints of the Roman Church.—*See* "THE STANDARD OF CATHOLICITY," *Appendix*, No. iii.

If, sir, you have taken the precaution to scrutinize before hand the character of that company of Saints to whose patronage you have recently committed your soul; or if, having neglected to do so, you will now give the volume from which I have quoted, a careful perusal, I have no doubt you will readily admit, that the extracts which I have given from it are a fair sample of the whole of its contents. Besides general statements of the labours of "the five Saints" in the zealous propagation of the Roman System, and accounts of miracles to which it would be easier to find a parallel in the adventures of Baron Munchhausen, than in the pages of Holy Writ, the book contains little else than repetitions *ad nauseam* of proofs, such as I have adduced, that the Saints possessed the "theological and cardinal virtues" in that "heroical degree," which, according to the verdict of the Head of the Roman Church, pronounced "by virtue of the supreme power given him," * qualifies them to co-operate with Christ, as meritorious co-efficients, in the work of redemption.

I will not trouble you with any expression of the feelings which again and again rose in my mind, while employed in transferring to my pages these wretched caricatures of apostolic labours and sufferings; but I will venture to express a confident persuasion, that while your eye

* Lives of the Saints, Introd. p. xviii.

shall follow this exhibition of the character, the virtues and merits of your spiritual patrons and patterns,* something akin to the crimson-blush of shame will suffuse your cheek, some sensation of remorse assail your heart: for never, till assured of it by yourself, will I believe, that the deep and holy reverence with which your brethren of the Anglican Church are wont to speak and think of God and of divine things, has all at once departed from your soul; that you have so soon become imbued with the spirit of that shameless obduracy and profaneness, with which the Roman Church spews forth into the world her enormous lies and blasphemies.

* You have no option in this matter: you are bound devoutly to worship their memory, to take them for your models, to rely, concurrently, on the efficacy of their merits and intercessions for the salvation of your soul. So at least say they who are "better judges than yourself" of what you ought to believe and to do. These Saints have been solemnly canonized, and "canonization extends to the whole world;" it is not, like beatification, "simply tolerated," but "*enjoined* to the faithful."—*(Lives of the Saints*, Introd. p. vii.) Your "Supreme Head" has "declared them to be Saints, and enrolled them in the catalogue of Saints, enjoining the universal Church devoutly to worship their memory yearly upon their natal day," (*ibid.* p. xviii.) and you cannot, therefore, be so surly and so disobedient a son of "the holy Roman Church," as to withhold your heart and voice from the general "thanksgiving to God on the part of the Church, for the acquisition of so many new heroes, protectors, and models."—*Ibid.* p. xxiii.

Worthy indeed of that corrupt tree of doctrine, which in my last Letter I have exposed, are the fruits of holiness, which the Roman Church chronicles of the chosen jewels of her crown. No one that attentively examines the Roman scheme of justification, contained in her own authorized statements, will be surprised that such should be its practical results. "A corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit; by their fruits ye shall know them." Had you remembered this, had you examined either the tree, or the fruits, you could not have been seduced by the "fervency" and "punctuality" of such devotion as Roman Saints exhibit, nor by the vain pretences of unity, universality, antiquity, and supremacy, with which the Roman Church has so lamentably beguiled you.

To these pretences, first admitted, and then adopted, by yourself, I now turn; and proceed to examine in the first place your assumption, that *perfect unity and uniformity* reign within the Church of Rome. Upon this point you lay very great stress; you describe her as having "maintained holy order and discipline among her motley crew;" you see in her that body, "of which all the parts are harmoniously fitted in, for the efficient movement of the whole to its intended end;" you even venture to assert broadly that "in the [Roman] Catholic Church *there is*

no disagreement whatever; every priest, from one end of the earth to the other, every *properly instructed* member of the Church, in all the earth, concurs in the confession of the same faith." I stop not to cavil at the large door of escape which you have left open behind you, by enabling yourself to impeach the "*instruction*" of those who happen to violate, by their theory or practice, your ideal conception of the unity of the Roman Church; neither do I propose to myself to disprove your sweeping assertion by merely showing that there have been occasional disagreements in her communion. The real fact which it concerns me to make apparent, is, that in the Roman Church, (beyond the fundamental articles of faith contained in the creeds, which she has in common with other branches of the Church Catholic,) there is *no agreement whatever*, except *the agreement to differ*. You may find among what you most appropriately term "her motley crew" every imaginable shade of opinion on matters of doctrine, and every conceivable variety of discipline. It is notoriously the principle of the Roman Church, to give abundant latitude to theological speculation on the one hand, and on the other hand to allow free scope to every inclination and every conceit in matters of discipline; she is alike tolerant of the most profligate luxury and of the most austere asce-

ticism, of the wildest freaks of fanaticism and of the driest dogmatism of an irreverent school-theology. As long as the crafty policy of the Vatican is not embarrassed, and the proud supremacy of St. Peter's successor not endangered, what cares Rome for unity of faith, for uniformity of discipline? But let the disputes and differences assume a threatening aspect; let there be a tendency in the opinions broached, to lead men's thoughts to farther inquiry into that truth which is diametrically opposed to the lie of Romanism; let the measures proposed or adopted have in them the least savour of independence, which might hereafter lead to emancipation from the spiritual despotism of the "Supreme Head;" wondrously sensitive will in that case be the solicitude of the Vicar of Christ, to maintain unity of faith and uniformity of discipline among all the branches and members of the great family subject to his sway.

And how does this solicitude manifest itself? What measures does he take to prevent disunion in the common camp? He does not attempt to instruct, or to convince; his authority is not even exerted, in many cases, to decide the point at issue, however important: he is content to enjoin silence on the disputants, and to bid the discordant members rest motionless. If they acquiesce, the agreement at which alone the

Roman Church aims, the agreement to differ, is happily restored: if not, the monastic retreat, the lonely dungeon, and, when times and circumstances are favourable, the torture and the stake, are the powerful persuasives which, from tender regard for their souls, "holy Mother Church" applies to the bodies of her dissentient and refractory children.

That this is the true character of the pretended unity of the Roman Church, is evident upon every page of her annals; and that equally so, whether we carry back her history into those dark ages, during which the Western world had been successfully brought into bondage to her superstitions and usurpations, or examine the state of her doctrine, discipline, and worship, as exhibited, at different periods and in different countries, subsequently to the Council of Trent.

As regards her mode of worship, for instance, you cannot but be aware that in this country the pure and scriptural liturgy used to this day by the Anglican Church, was not substituted for a liturgy in universal use throughout those portions even of the Church Catholic, which had for a time bowed their head under the yoke of Roman supremacy. There existed no such universal liturgy, nor even in the different national churches any uniformity of worship whatever. In Italy itself we find the ancient liturgies of Milan and

Aquileia firmly established by the side of the Roman; our own Church had different "Uses" in different dioceses, under the auspices of Rome; and her uniformity in this respect dates precisely from the time of her separation from your alleged "centre of Unity."* It was not till nineteen years after the establishment of an uniform liturgy in the Anglican Church, that the Roman Church made an attempt to effect a like uniformity in those parts of Christendom which remained attached to her communion, by the Breviary and the Bull "*Quod a nobis*," published in 1568 by Pius V.†

* "Where heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this realm; some following Salisbury Use, some Hereford Use, some the Use of Bangor, some of York, and some of Lincoln; now from henceforth, all the whole realm shall have but one Use."—*The Book of the Common Prayer, &c. &c., after the use of the Church of England.* Lond. 1549. *The Preface.*—This testimony to the diversity of worship in our national Church before the Reformation is still preserved in the Preface to our Book of Common Prayer, under the head "*Concerning the Service of the Church.*"

† This Bull, from which the modern Breviary primarily derives its authority, distinctly states, that the object of its publication is "to take away the diversity of worship," and accordingly takes away and abolishes "all other Roman Breviaries, and all other Breviaries," and prescribes the use of the present Breviary "throughout the world;" making an exception, nevertheless, in favour of those Breviaries which had been in use for more than 200 years previously under the sanction of the proper authority, in regard to which it is left optional, whether they shall be continued in

Notwithstanding this attempt, uniformity of rites is not to this day established throughout the churches of the Roman obedience, partly by reason of the exceptions allowed in the first instance, partly through omissions and alterations which may under peculiar circumstances appear expedient,* partly through practices contrary to

the churches where they had been so used, or the present Breviary substituted for them.—"*Summa Bullarum Summ. Pontif.*" in the first volume of "*Breviarium Romanum.* Mechlin. 1836."—Compare with this the complaints of the diversities of ministrations in the Brief of BENEDICT XIV., published 1596; from which Extracts are prefixed to the "*Pontificale Romanum.* Romæ, 1818."

* The Ritual published by authority for the use of the English Romanists, (*Ordo Administrandi Sacramenta, et alia quædam Officia Ecclesiastica rite peragendi, in Missione Anglicanâ; ex Rituali Romano jussu Pauli Quinti Edito extractus: nonnullis adjectis ex Antiquo Rituali Anglicano.* Lond. 1831,) does not accord with the Roman Ritual. Not only are there certain additions "from the Ancient Anglican Ritual," avowed on the title-page; but on comparison with the Roman Ritual it appears that some of the ceremonials, such as the "Benediction of a new Cross," and the "Consecration of Churches," are greatly simplified; while some others, *ex. gr.* the "Benediction of an Image of the Blessed Virgin Mary," and the "Benediction of Images of other Saints" are altogether omitted, being unfit, I suppose, to be exhibited before the profane eyes of surrounding heretics. The following two prayers from the forms of "Benediction of Images" will throw light upon the gross idolatries of the Roman Church, which it is no doubt convenient to keep out of sight *in partibus infidelium.*

In the form of "*Benediction of an Image of the Blessed*

the doctrine and discipline of Rome, made for the express purpose of enlarging the borders of

Virgin Mary" the closing prayer, before the final aspersion of the image with holy water, is to this effect:

" Almighty and everlasting God, by whose most merciful dispensation all things are created out of nothing, *vouchsafe to ✠ bless, and ✠ sanctify this image, reverently prepared in honour of the most pious Mother of thy Son*, our Lord Jesus Christ; and grant, O most merciful Father, by the invocation of thy name, and of the same thy only begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, whom thou willedst to become incarnate for the salvation of human kind with preservation of Mary's perfect Virginity, in regard of the prayers of the same most holy Virgin, that *whosoever shall give diligence before this image suppliantly to honour Her, the Queen of Mercy, and our most gracious Lady, may be delivered from impending dangers, and obtain pardon of their transgressions* in the sight of thy divine Majesty; and may in this time present merit *the grace* which they desire to attain, and in the time to come *rejoice in thy everlasting salvation* together with thine elect; by the same thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the Unity of the Holy Ghost, one God, world without end. Amen."

In the form of "*Benediction of Images of other Saints*," we have this prayer:—

" Almighty and everlasting God, *who dost not disapprove the graving or painting of images or likenesses of thy Saints*,' [see Exod, xx. 4, 5,] " to the intent that as often as we look upon them with the eyes of our body, we may with the eyes of the memory contemplate and study to imitate their actions and sanctity; vouchsafe, *we beseech Thee, to ✠ bless and ✠ sanctify this image, (or statue,) prepared in honour and to the memory of the blessed N. thy Apostle*, (or Martyr, or Confessor, or Pontiff, or Virgin);

the Roman dominion,* and partly in consequence of that palpable imitation of the Pantheism of ancient Rome, the worship of local saints,† and local images of the Virgin, whose commemorations

and grant, that *whosoever shall give diligence before this image (or statue) suppliantly to honour the same thy most glorious Apostle*, (or Martyr, or Confessor, or Pontiff, or Virgin,) *may by his* (or her) *prayers and intercession obtain* from Thee *grace* in this time present, and *eternal glory* in the time to come, through thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who liveth" &c. &c.—See "*Pontificale Romanum: Romæ*, 1818;" pp. 343, 344.

* Of this kind are the concessions made to the Maronites, whose allegiance to the Roman See was purchased at the price of various deviations from the Roman discipline, and that with regard to some of those very points, to the maintenance of which the peace and union of the Western churches had been so wantonly sacrificed. Their priests are suffered to marry, and the laity are admitted to the communion in both kinds. See *Acta Synodi provinc. Maronitarum in Monte Libano, A°* 1596 *hab. can.* xi.; and *Additio ad super. Synod. can.* ii. These privileges are enjoyed by the Maronites to the present day.

The disgraceful concessions made by the Jesuit Missionaries in the East, to the idolatrous tenets and practices of the heathen, are another instance of the pliability of Roman discipline, where Roman power can be increased by concession.

† The following is the title of the Roman Missal, in use in this country, published in London, 1840, "with the approbation of all the Rt. Rev. the Vicars Apostolic of England." "The Missal for the use of the Laity, with the Masses for all days throughout the year, according to the Roman Missal; and *those for the English Saints* in their respective places."

and litanies vary in different countries and at different shrines.

If from the prescribed forms of worship we turn to the discipline of the Roman Church, a striking proof of that spirit of latitudinarian accommodation, by which she conciliates the most opposite and extreme tendencies of the human mind, so as at once to enlist them in her service, and to maintain the illusion of unity, presents itself in the system of religious orders without number, having each its own peculiar constitution and rule, according to the fancy of the founder; whose endless diversities, it is contended, do not violate the uniformity of discipline in the Church, because the Roman Pontiff is pleased to set upon them all the seal of his "apostolic" sanction. The wealthy, learned Benedictine, and the fanatical, mendicant Franciscan, the lordly, persecuting Dominican, and the humble, inoffensive Augustinian, the worldly, intriguing Jesuit, and the rude, laborious Trappist,—and whatever other names and characters there be of these intruders into the dioceses of the rightful rulers of Christ's flock, and intermeddlers with the regular work of the Ministry,—all find shelter under the capacious mantle of Roman uniformity; and though widely differing from each other, and opposed by their very existence to the original constitution of the Church, they are all made to fit admirably

into the general unity of the Roman communion,* the principle of which is agreement to differ, with concurrence in the one essential point of subjection to "the Supreme See and its possessor."

The same is the case with regard to the vaunted unity of doctrine in the Roman Church. Con-

* The course of this perfect unity did not, however, as might be expected, run at all times smooth. Not only came these orders into continual collision with the Bishops and the Parochial Clergy, and fell into great heats of emulation and controversy against one another, but their conduct towards the "Supreme Head" himself was not unfrequently that of unruly servants against a helpless master. Loud and bitter are the complaints on this subject, not only in the papal Manifestoes, but in the Acts of Councils, which again and again, but for the most part in vain, attempted to check the endless multiplication of religious orders, and the arrogant, lawless conduct of their members. As early as the year 1215 it was found necessary, in the fourth Lateran Council, to make the following decree, prohibiting additional religious orders:—

"In order that the too great diversity of religious rules may not induce serious confusion in the Church of God, we strictly prohibit any one inventing hereafter a new religious rule; but whoever wishes to embrace a religious life, let him betake himself to one of the rules already approved. In like manner, whoever wishes to found a new religious house, let him adopt a rule and constitution from among the approved religious rules."—*Concil. Lateran.* iv. *Decr. c.* xiii.

Notwithstanding this decree, passed in a Council accounted œcumenical by the Roman Church, the establishment of the order of Dominicans or Preaching Friars was

troversies, both upon speculative questions and upon vital points of faith, have again and again, and for a length of time, agitated her communion, both before and after the publication of that carefully digested synopsis of errors and curses contained in the Decrees, Canons, and Catechism

sanctioned in the following year by the very same Pope who presided in that Council, and publicly recognised immediately after by his successor; and many more have been established since, down to the order of the Redemptorists, the character of whose founder, St. Alphonso Liguori, has been brought under notice in an earlier part of this Letter. So glaring a violation, by the "Supreme Head" himself, of a decree solemnly passed by the Church under his own auspices, a violation frequently repeated since by his successors, is indeed a striking illustration of that kind of unity which reigns in the constitution and government of the Roman Church. Another no less characteristic instance of it is the conduct of the Roman Pontiffs with regard to the order of the Jesuits. This order, having been established, also in violation of the above decree of the fourth Lateran Council, by Paul III. in 1540, was saved from the suppression of it which Benedict XIV. meditated, only by the death of that Pontiff; was warmly supported by his successor Clement XIII.; totally suppressed by the next occupant of the Supreme See, Clement XIV. in 1773; and again re-established in the year 1814 by Pius VII. As regards the repeated complaints made in the official documents of the Roman Church, respecting the disorders and troubles caused by the religious orders, I beg further to refer you, among others, to *Concil. Lugdun.* ii. *Const.* xxiii. *A°.* 1274; *Concil. Saltzburg. c.* viii., *A°.* 1386; *Concil. Lateran.* v. *Sess.* xi. *Bulla de Privil. Religiosorum*, *A°.* 1516; *Concil. Colon.* i. *pars* iv. *c.* 7—12, *A°.* 1536.

of the Council of Trent, which you hesitate not to designate as "a beauteous and complete system of truth." It appears that at the very time when the Tridentine Catechism was drawn up, there existed, under shelter of the comprehensive unity of the Roman Church, antagonistic schools of divinity, even in that small and select band which arrogated to itself the representation of the Church Catholic; for in the Preface to the Catechism, special care is taken to have it understood, that the disciples of the school of Thomas Aquinas had not the sole charge of the church's orthodoxy, but that theologians of other schools had a share in the composition; lest the former supposition should operate prejudicially upon the authority of the Catechism.* The violence and duration of the controversy between the Thomists and Scotists upon the subject of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and the shuffling conduct of the Roman See in regard to it, are sufficiently notorious;† and no less famous

* *Catechism. Concil. Trident.* Ed. Mechlin. 1831. *Apparatus ad Catech. Art.* ii.

† After dividing the opinions of the Church for nearly a century and a half, a decision was come to in favour of the Scotist doctrine in the *Council of Basle*, (*Sess.* xxxvi. *A°.* 1439); and by a decree of Sixtus IV., *A°.* 1476, special indulgences were granted to those who should devoutly celebrate the Feast of the Immaculate Conception. (*Decr. Sixti* IV. *Extrav. Comm. l.* iii. *De Reliq. et vener. Sanct. c.* i.)

is the controversy on grace and free-will, raised, or rather renewed, towards the end of the sixteenth century, by Molina, on which the *Congregatio de Auxiliis* in vain deliberated for years, on which Paul V. enjoined both parties to be silent, awaiting his decision, which he promised to give "at a more convenient season," but

Yet had the same Pontiff seven years after that decree cause to complain, that "certain preachers of divers orders were not ashamed to declare in their sermons, that all those who held or asserted the glorious and immaculate Mother of God to have been conceived without stain of original sin, were guilty of mortal sin, and hereticks." This argues, certainly, little respect for the unity of the Church, as the charge so made by these preachers was directed against the Supreme Head of the Church, and a General Council: but what are we to think of the decision of Sixtus IV., who on the one hand decrees sentence of excommunication against all those who shall hereafter charge the maintainers of the immaculate conception with heresy and mortal sin, but at the same time decrees the same sentence of excommunication against those also, who shall charge the impugners of the immaculate conception with heresy and mortal sin; alleging, contrary to the plain decree of the Council of Basle, that no decision on the subject had yet been come to by the Roman Church and the Apostolic See? (*Decr. Sixti* IV. *Extrav. Comm. l.* iii. *De Reliq. et vener. Sanct. c.* ii.) Here, then, we have a festival instituted, and recommended by the grant of indulgences for its celebration on the part of the "Supreme Head," in commemoration of a fact which the same "Supreme Head" declares to be undecided! The same glorious uncertainty is scrupulously preserved by the Council of Trent, which subjoins to its Canons on original sin the following saving clause:—

never gave; whence the doctrines of Molina remain to this day among the open questions of Roman theology.*

It is true that the conduct of the Roman Church and her Supreme Head has not been on all occasions equally vacillating; but whenever

"This holy Synod however declares, that it is not intended to include in this decree, where original sin is treated of, the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, the Mother of God; but that the constitutions of Pope Sixtus IV. of blessed memory are to be observed under the penalties contained in the said constitutions, which penalties the holy Synod re-enacts. *(Concil. Trident. Sess.* v. *Decr. de Pecc. Orig. in fine.)* In this state the question is left to the present day; Pius V. contented himself with interdicting all discussion of it in the vulgar tongue; Gregory XV. went somewhat further, and issued his prohibition against any one asserting, even in private conversation, that the Blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin; but at the same time he made a special exception in favour of the Dominicans, allowing them in their conferences freedom of debate on the subject; *(Annot. ad Extrav. Comm. de Reliq. et vener. Sanct. Corp. Jur. Can. tom.* iii. *pars ult.* p. 315); and the same prohibition, with a like exception in favour of the Dominicans, was renewed by Alexander VII. *(Dens Theol. Moral. et Dogm. tom.* i. *Tract. de Pecc. No.* 137.)—Such is the method by which the Roman Church preserves her boasted unity!

* See *Dens Theol. Moral. et Dogm.* tom. i. *Tract. de Volunt. et Involunt.* No. 16; and tom. ii. *Tract. de Gratia*, No. 15, 20, 21; where the views of Molina are referred to as held by some, though generally rejected; at the same time that no reference whatever is made to them in the enumeration of errors on the doctrine of Grace condemned by the Church. See *Ibid.* No. 23—25.

a decisive course has been adopted, it has been marked by tyranny and violence, and has led to the most disastrous breaches of Church unity, except when the assistance of the secular arm has for a time been ready and strong enough to exterminate by fire and sword those whose convictions were too deeply rooted and too sincere to make them amenable to bulls and anathemas. Not only has many a heretic, rendered obstinate in his error by unchristian persecution, been crushed under the wheels of the idol-car of the Papacy; but many a faithful follower of the truth as it is in Jesus, raised up by God as a witness against her corruptions, has by the Roman Church been made to seal his testimony with the blood of martyrdom: your supposed antitype of the ancient Israel, answering to Jerusalem of old in this particular also, that she "killeth her prophets," and "stoneth," or, as her fashion is, burneth, "them that are sent unto her." What is the history of the Unity of the Roman Church during the three centuries which preceded the Reformation, but a continuous record of dark deeds of blood, for which the name of Christ, and the defence of the truth, were the pretexts, and the real motive the maintenance of the Roman usurpation? How was her Unity preserved at the period of the Reformation, but by presenting to the Western branches of the Church Catholic wilful heresy

and superstition on the one hand, and involuntary schism on the other, as the only alternative left them, and repelling from her communion those churches whose light and grace were sufficient to make them "obey God rather than men?" And how have the measures of decision operated, which she has since, from time to time, adopted with a view to preserve unity within the wreck of her former dominion? What has been the fruit of her efforts to suppress the openly condemned doctrines of Jansenism, which have now for the space of two centuries been a cause of unceasing discord in some portion or other of the Roman communion?* Who can read the history of the Gallican Church from the rise of Jansenism, and more especially from the publication of the Bull *Unigenitus*, without coming to the conclusion that the violence with which, not controversy only, but actual warfare, was carried on between the Jansenists and the Jesuits, paved the way for those infidel principles, which from the

* To follow the Jansenist controversy through its details, would be obviously impossible, within the limits to which I must confine myself in spite of the materials which continue to accumulate under my hands. I shall therefore content myself with referring, on this particular point, to the able enumeration of the breaches of Unity produced by Jansenism in the Roman Church, which has been given by the Rev. W. Palmer, in his *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, part i., ch. xi., App. i.

middle of the last century began to develope themselves, and which contributed, far more than the ambition of the 14th, the profligacy of the 15th, and the imbecility of the 16th Louis, to bring about that revolution by which the throne and the altar were together swept away?

The Roman boast of Unity, therefore, is a mere assumption, which "ecclesiastical history altogether annihilates;" and no less unfounded is *the assumption of Universality*, which you put forth on behalf of the Church of Rome, as *inseparable from her Unity*. The sentences of excommunication which the spiritual usurper has at different times fulminated from "the eternal city" against other and purer branches of the Universal Church, no more avail to deprive them of their catholic and apostolic character, than the appellation of "barbarians," which the celestial despot of Pekin rejoices to affix to all the nations of the earth except his own, can take away their civilization and reduce them to the savage state. The arrogant denial of that which others possess, even in a superior degree, is in both cases equally impotent and ridiculous.

What are the real facts of the case? All the Churches of the earth had in the first instance, it is true, "communion with St. Peter, while he lived, and his successors in Rome after his death." But this does not prove that the Roman Church

was then *the Universal Church;* which is, in fact, what Romanists assert, when they represent communion with Rome as the *sine quâ non* of comprehension in the Church Catholic: it only proves, what no one has ever dreamt of denying, that the Roman Church was then *a part of, and in communion with, the Universal Church.* It is again true, that this communion of all the Churches of the earth with the Roman Church has ceased; but this does not prove, either that *the Church Universal has ceased to exist,* or that those Churches which are no longer in communion with Rome, have *ceased to be Churches,* or branches of the Church Universal: it only proves, that *the Roman Church,* though she may continue to be a part of, *no longer is in communion with, the Church Universal.*

Farther than this the argument of fact can never be carried; the result of that argument is, that the Roman Church stands, with her partisan-sisters, self-excommunicated before the Church Catholic; giving, by her vain pretensions, the lie to God's word, which saith: "God hath set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him. And *if they were all one member, where were the body?* But now are they many members, yet but one body." * Even so hath God set the different Churches of the

* 1 Cor. xii. 18—20.

earth, every one of them, in the Church Catholic, as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one Roman Church,* where were the Church Catholic? But now are they many Churches, yet but one Church Catholic.

The soundness of this reasoning can be impeached upon one ground only, which is, that the Roman Church, or her Bishop, is by divine right the head of the body of the Church Catholic; and

* This is actually the style which the Roman Church assumes in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., published in the year 1564, in the Bull "*Injunctum nobis:*" "I acknowledge the *Holy Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church* for the Mother and Mistress of all the Churches;" after which the Creed proceeds; "And I promise true Obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ. I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent. And I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church has condemned, rejected, and anathematized. I, N. N., do at this present freely profess, and sincerely hold, this true Catholic Faith, *without which no one can be saved.*"

The profession of faith, from which the foregoing is an extract, has been solemnly made by you more than once, since your defection from the Anglican Church; once at your "conversion," and since again at your "ordination." How, then, can you venture to amuse your readers with the latitudinarian sentiments recorded on pp. 26—28 of your Letter?

You say, *inter alia*, that it is "not at all inconsistent with the maintenance of the supreme divine rights of the

the question consequently resolves itself into that of the alleged supremacy of the Roman See, as the only ground upon which the universality of the Roman Church can be maintained; a question to which, as it will shortly again present itself in the regular course of my argument, I need not now farther advert.

The next point to which I have to address myself, is *your assumption that the Roman Church is ancient.* There is a popular way of setting

Church, and of her sole claim to the incorporation with her of all the members of Christ, and heirs of eternal life, that *there may be out of her those who yet are not necessarily to be deemed excluded from the final and most inestimable blessing of salvation.*"

"Without acknowledging the seven Sacraments, the Tridentine doctrine of Justification, the Sacrifice of the Mass, transubstantiation, purgatory, the invocation of Saints, the veneration due to images and relics, the power of indulgences, the Roman Church as Supreme See, and the Roman Bishop as Christ's Vicar, *no one can be saved;*" says the Creed of Pius IV., in which all the above points are enumerated as articles of faith. "A man may deny all these, (by your own showing the Anglican Church in her Articles rejects them unequivocally,) and *yet he may be saved,*" says your Letter. You have adopted and made profession of that Creed, and you have written and published this Letter. At what time are your words worthy of credit? When you stand at the foot of the Roman altar? or when you sit at your table, writing to your former brethren of the Anglican Church? You are either grossly deceiving Rome, or grossly deceiving the English public, or, which I take to be the real fact, *most grossly deceiving yourself:* an inconsistent Anglican first, and now an inconsistent Romanist.

forth this assumption, which constitutes the favourite *ad captandum* argument of Romanists, because it carries with it, to the unthinking multitude, a considerable degree of plausibility. "We are *the old Church*," they say; "yours is *the new Church*;" or, as it is often put, "Where was your Church before the Reformation?"—I will not offer you the insult of supposing, that you would intentionally endeavour to impose upon your readers by so palpable a fallacy; I take it for granted, that when you speak of "the Church of twelve centuries in England, and of eighteen centuries in the world," you mean to assert, that *in those points on which the Roman Church is at issue with other Churches, and more especially with the Anglican Church, the Roman Church has the consent of antiquity on her side.* This, indeed, appears clearly to be your meaning in another passage, where you say, that if the Anglican Church be "sound in her present doctrinal tenets," the Roman Church is "most unsound, whether she be regarded *at any time* previous or subsequent to the sixteenth century; for she is *the same now as then*, in doctrine and discipline."

As regards "the Church of twelve centuries in England," I have already pointed out to you in my first Letter the strange historical oversight, which has enabled you to talk of "the ancient Church of England as *first formed* by Augus-

tine;" and as far as the Anglican Church is concerned, I might content myself with saying, that as you can show that which you call the Church, for no more than twelve centuries in England, and I can show you that which I call the Church, in England for at least fifteen, and not improbably for eighteen centuries, mine is evidently the old Church, and yours the new. But I have no desire to beat you with your own weapons, seeing how blunt and brittle they are; and I prefer, therefore, to argue the point with you in reference to "the Church of eighteen centuries in the world."

Do I, then, understand you to assert, that *at any time* during the eighteen centuries since the first promulgation of the Gospel, the Church Catholic, *i. e.* according to your interpretation, that part of Christendom which was in communion with Rome, has been the same in doctrine and discipline as the Roman Church now is? If this be your meaning, it would have been greatly for the convenience of my argument, if you had condescended to adduce a few proofs of this identity of the self-styled Catholic Church of the present day with the Church Catholic of eighteen centuries ago, at least in reference to the principal points on which the former avowedly differs from the Anglican, and is supposed to differ from the ancient Catholic Church. It would have been,

I say, convenient, if you had pointed out on what grounds you rest the assertion, that the doctrines of seven Sacraments,—of progressive justification by the use of sacraments, by works of satisfaction and by expiatory sufferings, both in this life and in purgatory,—of transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the Mass, and the denial of the cup to the laity,—of the intercession of the Virgin Mary and of Saints,—of the invocation of their names, and the veneration due to their images and relics, —of indulgences,—of the supremacy, spiritual and temporal, of the Roman Bishop,—have been uniformly held for eighteen centuries.

This is, I am sure, more than the most undaunted of Roman controversialists would undertake to prove. The fact is, that as a whole, in their systematic connexion with each other, those distinctive doctrines of the Tridentine creed can scarcely be said to have prevailed in the Church even as late as the twelfth century; and hardly any of them can, even with the help of isolated, ambiguous statements or practices, for which individuals only, and not the body of the Church Universal, are responsible, be traced back to the Ante-Nicene period. The nine centuries which intervened between the Nicene and fourth Lateran Councils thus form the tilting-ground, on which the Romanist and Protestant champions are wont to hold their jousts. On that field I do not pro-

pose, at least for the present, to enter the lists with you; but shall, after making one remark, leave you in full possession of any advantage which you may there hope to gain. The remark I wish to make is this: Romanists being pressed hard for evidence in the earlier ages, are wont to produce passages from the Fathers which have but a very remote and indistinct bearing upon the point, in support of which they are adduced; and to help out their insufficiency, it is generally pleaded, that if the Fathers had been able to foresee the controversies which have since arisen, and the denial of the doctrines which they are alleged to have held, they would no doubt have expressed themselves with greater clearness and precision. This is undoubtedly possible; but it is also possible, on the other hand, that if the Fathers had been able to foresee, what use would be made of their language hereafter, in support of error and superstition, they would have expressed themselves in a more guarded manner; so as to prevent the imputation to them in after-ages of doctrines which they never held, and from which, even though they should have approximated towards them, they would most assuredly have shrunk, had they been able to behold them in their full maturity and fertility of corruption.

Having thrown out this suggestion, which may prove useful in cross-examining the Fathers as

witnesses in the inquisition concerning this or that disputed doctrine, I now proceed to those two points upon which the issue of the antiquity of the Roman Church really depends. Supposing, for the facility of argument, that you could prove, what you never can, an essential identity of doctrine and discipline in regard to the points before mentioned from the beginning of the fourth to the beginning of the thirteenth century, this would neither establish in favour of the Roman Church that degree of antiquity which is necessary for your argument, nor would it protect the present Roman Church from the charge of subsequent innovation.

No demonstration of antiquity is sufficient for your purpose, which can be met by a demonstration of greater antiquity in favour of the doctrine and discipline opposed to that of Rome. But however far back you may carry that age in which you assume that the present doctrine and discipline of Rome originated, the Anglican Church will ever present to you in return a still earlier age upon which she founds her doctrine and discipline. That age is the age of the Apostles themselves, the age of whose doctrine and discipline the New Testament Scriptures afford infallible evidence. That age is not only the most ancient, but it is the only age to which, as to a standard, the doctrine and discipline of the

Church in after-ages is referable. If the doctrine and discipline of any subsequent age do not accord, with this, it is a matter of perfect indifference, whether one or ten centuries intervene between the two; in either case we are, even on the principle of antiquity alone, (to say nothing of the plenary inspiration of the agents and the records which belong to it,) bound to give the preference to the earlier, that is, to the Apostolic age.

If this be true, it only remains to be proved, that the Roman Church does not, and that the Anglican does, found her doctrine and discipline upon the first or Apostolic age; and this it is not difficult to do out of the mouth of the two Churches themselves. The Anglican Church, on the one hand, professes in her Articles to derive her doctrine and discipline from the pattern of the Apostolic age, as exhibited in Scripture; she makes this the specific ground on which she imposes that doctrine and discipline upon her members;* and she thereby challenges both them, and all the world, as I now again challenge you, to point out any particular wherein she departs from the Apostolic pattern exhibited in Scripture, either in her doctrine or in her discipline. The Roman Church, on the other hand, plainly confesses, that for the

* *Art.* vi. viii. xx. xxi. xxxiv. and *Can.* xxxvi. of the Anglican Church.

warrant of her doctrine and discipline the evidence of the doctrine and discipline of the Apostolic age contained in holy Scripture is insufficient, and for this reason requires her members in the first place "stedfastly to admit and embrace *the Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the holy Roman Church;*" and after this she brings before them the holy Scriptures, but with this limitation, that they shall "admit them according to that sense which our holy Mother the Church has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures," and that they shall never "take and interpret them otherwise, than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."* In other words, the Roman Church makes the doctrine and discipline of after-ages the standard, by which the doctrine and discipline of the Apostolic age is to be judged; whilst the Anglican Church takes the doctrine and discipline of the Apostolic age as the standard to be applied to that of all subsequent ages. Which, therefore, of the two Churches be the more jealous of, or the best supported by antiquity, I leave you to judge.

But there is another point on which the claim of the Roman Church to antiquity must fail, I mean the charge of subsequent innovation.

* Creed of Pope Pius IV.

Whatever may have been the doctrine and discipline of the Roman Church before the sixteenth century, and whatever the origin of each separate portion of her complicated system, it is quite certain that the Council of Trent made therein a most essential change; forasmuch as, under the sanction of its many and heavy curses, it imposed, or attempted to impose, upon the Church *as terms of communion* for ever after, much that had, indeed, previously existed in her doctrine and discipline, but had up to that time been open to inquiry and amendment, not having received the solemn and irrevocable sanction of a professedly infallible Synod of the Church. Viewed in this light, it is clear that the Roman Church, in her present character and constitution, as well as in her position towards other communions, dates her existence from the Council of Trent, whose decrees were not promulgated till the year 1564; a fact which, I need hardly say, completely "annihilates" her claim to antiquity.*

* Even if the Anglican Church were, what Romanists are fond of representing her to be, a "modern establishment," she would thus have the advantage of seniority over Rome. But as her Articles do not impose any terms of communion except those contained in Scripture, it is evidently most unjust to charge her with novelty upon the ground of her re-enacting the ancient standard; by reverting to which, after a season of participation in the "presumptuous innovations" of Rome, she proved herself truly "the Church of eighteen centuries."

Having proceeded thus far in my argument, I am now in a situation to enter upon that point on which your prejudice in favour of the Roman Church is mainly based, and which, as it truly is the key-stone of the Roman fabric, I have reserved to the last, in order to make it the key-stone of my argument likewise; I mean *the assumption that the Roman See is the "Supreme See" of the Church Catholic, and its possessor her "Supreme earthly Head."* As this is a question which will necessarily require much reference both to Scripture, and to the testimony of the Early Church, I am again reluctantly compelled to break off here, and to reserve the remainder of my argument for another Letter.

In the mean time believe me,

Your faithful brother in the Lord,

G. E. B.

Coombe Wood,
March 4, 1842.

☞ The notes in Letter III. p. 46 and 47, have been inadvertently transposed; the note on p. 46 belonging to the words "Catholic Church" on p. 47; and *vice versâ*, the note on p. 47 to the words "He offered" on p. 46.

Price 1*s.* 6*d. each,* LETTERS I. II. AND III. OF

CATHOLICITY v. SIBTHORP;

Or, Some Help to answer the question, whether the REV. R. W. SIBTHORP, B.D. is now or ever was a Catholic?

In a series of Letters addressed to him by the REV. G. E. BIBER, LL.D., Presbyter of the Anglo-Catholic Church.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

1 *Vol. 8vo. Price* 14*s.*,

THE STANDARD OF CATHOLICITY,

Or an Attempt to point out in a plain Manner certain safe and leading Principles, amidst the conflicting Opinions by which the Church is at present agitated.

Price 1*s.*

OUR DAY OF SIFTING:

A plain SERMON for these perplexing Times, preached on New Year's Day 1842, at St. Andrew's Church, Ham.

Also, Price 1*s.*,

THE LORD'S HOUSE:

A SERMON, preached on Sunday Evening, October 24th, 1841, at the *Chapel of Ease, Robinhood Hamlet,* in aid of the Funds now collecting for the Endowment of the said Chapel.

Published by Request, in aid of the Endowment Fund.

Also, Price 1*s.* 6*d.*,

THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

RECOMMENDED TO THE YOUNG,

IN A LETTER ADDRESSED TO HIS PUPILS.

And, Price 1*s.* 6*d.*,

GOD'S HOLY PRESENCE.

A LETTER ADDRESSED TO HIS PUPILS.

CATHOLICITY v. SIBTHORP;

OR,

SOME HELP TO ANSWER THE QUESTION,

WHETHER

THE REV. R. W. SIBTHORP, B.D.

IS NOW OR EVER WAS

A CATHOLIC?

IN A SERIES OF LETTERS ADDRESSED TO HIM

BY

THE REV. G. E. BIBER, LL.D.

Presbyter of the Anglo-Catholic Church.

Letter the Fifth.

LONDON:

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD; AND

WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;

AND JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

1842.

LONDON:
Printed by Maurice and Co., Fenchurch Street.

TO

THE REV. R. W. SIBTHORP.

SIR,

The last head of my argument, necessarily reserved at the close of my fourth Letter, is *your assumption, that the Roman See is the "Supreme See" of the Church Catholic, and its possessor her "Supreme earthly Head."* As far as this assumption of yours is founded on inferential reasoning, and on the fancied correspondence of the Church militant as the antitype with the ancient Israel, its alleged type, I have already shown its untenableness in my second Letter ; it remains, therefore, now only for me to examine into your assertion,—unsupported, indeed, as all your assertions are, by any thing like proof,—that the supremacy of the Roman See and its successor is capable of being demonstrated from Scripture and the early Fathers. Once more then, and happily for the last time, I will set about

disproving that which you have not proved, but only, *more Romano*, affirmed. Your case from Scripture is thus put by yourself:—

"There is in the New Testament, a remarkable promise given to one of the twelve Apostles, (St. Matthew, xvi. 16—19,) which we must view in connexion with an extraordinary exhortation afterwards addressed to him, (St. John, xxi. 15—17,) and a very peculiar position held by him, (Acts ii. iii. iv. x. xii.): *all which* also, from the striking accordance with the Jewish type, which they give the Christian Church, *warrant the inference* that the Lord in his kingdom, his body, his family, his household, acts on the same principle and plan on which he has acted in nature, and guided man to act in ordinary arrangements of this life. *It is not correct* that what is allowed to have been once *appropriated to St. Peter*, was afterwards made *common to all the Apostles*. No other Apostle *shared his office in the formation of the Church*. To no other Apostle was *such a solemn exhortation given, to feed the flock of God*, as to him. And though the Lord did afterwards give the power of the keys to all the Apostles, that no more affected the previous distinction of *the separate gift to him*, (see St. Matth. xvi. 16,) than the Lord's calling all his Apostles beloved, affects the claim of St. John to be pre-eminently '*the beloved disciple*.'— Briefly, but sufficiently, is the establishment of a centre of unity for his Church declared by Christ, while it was left to the providence of God, (not to accident,) to develope in time its design, growth, and prerogatives."

It must be confessed that the Roman Church,

not in other respects particularly celebrated for the modesty of her demands, is remarkably moderate in her expectations, when she looks to Scripture for evidence in support of her system. A very small matter will then suffice her, and the slenderest possible foundation be accounted strong enough to bear the superincumbent weight of a structure, under which the very earth itself groans.

But I must not digress. Let us look a little more narrowly to your points. The address of Christ to St. Peter, so far as it relates to the question in hand, divides itself into two parts:—

1. "Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church."—*Matth.* xvi. 18.

2. "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."—*Mat.* xvi. 19.

Concerning the other Apostles we read:—

1. "Ye are built upon *the foundation of the Apostles* and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."—*Eph.* ii. 20—22.

"The wall of the city had *twelve foundations*, and in them the names of the *twelve Apostles* of the Lamb."—*Revel.* xxi. 14.

Again we find them thus addressed by Christ:

"Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."—*Matth.* xviii. 18.

"Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."—*John* xx. 22, 23.

On comparison of these passages with those before quoted which refer to St. Peter only, there certainly does appear to ordinary understandings a remarkable correspondence; and for my own part I freely confess, that my ingenuity is completely baffled by the attempt to discover, wherein that distinction consists, which makes it incorrect to say, that what "had been once appropriated to St. Peter, was afterwards made common to all the Apostles."

But, you say, we must view the promise made to St. Peter in connexion with "the extraordinary exhortation afterwards addressed to him." The discourse in question is as follows:—

"Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved, because He said unto

him the third time, Lovest thou me? and he said unto Him, Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep."—*John* xxi. 15—17.

On examining this narrative, it appears to present the following three points:—

1. The claim of Jesus upon Peter for greater love than the other Apostles bore him.

2. The enforcement of that claim, by the question thrice repeated: "Lovest thou me?"

3. The command to feed Christ's flock, also thrice repeated.

All this appears to be easily accounted for, without any mysterious reference to an undefined embryo of Papal supremacy, hereafter to be developed.

1. Upon the principle that he will love his Lord most, to whom he forgave most, (Luke vii. 41—47,) it is clear that Peter would love Christ more than the other Apostles, because he had sinned more grievously against him, in that he denied him.

2. The fact that Peter denied Christ thrice, is sufficient to account for the threefold repetition of the question, "Lovest thou me?" and the sorrow which Peter felt,—not certainly because he imagined that he who knoweth all things doubted his love,—shows that Peter felt the full force of the reproof implied in the repetition.

3. The command to St. Peter to feed Christ's flock,—thrice repeated, because the profession of love on which it was founded, was thrice drawn from his lips,—differs in no other respect than this from the command given, not only to other Apostles, but to their fellow-labourers and successors.

"The presbyters [saith St. Peter] which are among you, I exhort, who am also a presbyter,* and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: *Feed the flock of God* which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And *when the Chief Shepherd shall appear*, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."—1 *Pet.* v. 1—4.

"Take heed [saith St. Paul] unto yourselves and to *all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God*, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."—*Acts* xx. 28—30.

Again I confess, that I am at a loss to discover the essential difference assumed by you, between the command to feed Christ's flock given to St.

* He does not say, 'who am the chief of presbyters, the Prince of Apostles, the invisible Chief Shepherd's visible Vicegerent,' but, "who am also a presbyter."

Peter, and the same command given to other chosen disciples and witnesses.*

But, say you, St. Peter held a very peculiar position; and in illustration you refer to certain transactions recorded in the Acts. The circumstances in those transactions, which bear upon this question, may be reduced under the following heads:—

1. That St. Peter took the lead on the day of Pentecost in the conversion of that multitude which formed the nucleus of the Church at Jerusalem.—*Acts* ii.

2. That St. Peter was spokesman on the occasion of the healing of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate, and subsequently before the Sanhedrin.—*Acts* iii. iv.

3. That St. Peter was the first preacher of the

* The case of St. John, with which you endeavour to help out the manifest poverty of your argument, affords no parallel, because there are certain proofs on record which show him to have been pre-eminently beloved: "he leaned on his breast at supper," and was the only one who durst put the question, "Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee?" (*John* xiii. 22—26; xxi. 20); to him did Jesus on the cross commit his mother, (*John* xix. 26, 27); and his pre-eminence is put beyond all doubt by his being designated as "that disciple whom Jesus loved." (*John* xxi. 7. comp. xx. 2). No proof can be adduced of St. Peter's alleged supremacy, such as we have here of St. John's personal nearness to our Lord; nor do we ever find St. Peter spoken of as "that disciple to whom Jesus gave the power of the keys;" which would be the parallel case to that of St. John.

Gospel to the Gentiles, and the founder of the first Gentile church.—*Acts* x.

4. That St. Peter suffered persecution for the truth's sake, and was miraculously delivered from the hands of his persecutors.—*Acts* xii.

Let us examine each of these heads separately, and see what bearing it has upon the alleged supremacy of St. Peter.

1. Although undoubtedly St. Peter took the lead in explaining to the multitude the miraculous effusion of the Holy Ghost, yet the conversion of 3000 souls on that day is not to be attributed exclusively to that explanation and the exhortation by which it was followed; no small share in that result evidently belongs to the gift of tongues which accompanied the effusion of the Holy Spirit, and which manifested itself equally in all the Apostles. (*Acts* ii. 3—12). Neither is the address made on this occasion by St. Peter to be considered as altogether his own; for he made it in the name of the whole company, (*ibid.* v. 32,) and was so understood by the people, who asked, not "*Sir*," but "*Men and brethren*, what shall we do?" (*ibid.* v. 37). In like manner "the signs and wonders" through which the Church of Jerusalem, planted on the day of Pentecost, daily increased, were not wrought only, or chiefly, by St. Peter, but generally "by the Apostles."—(*Ibid.* v. 43). But what most clearly proves

that the pre-eminence which St. Peter had on this occasion, as "chief speaker," neither arose from, nor led to, any supremacy on his part in the Church, is the manner in which the constitution of that Church is described: "they continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship," (*ibid.* v. 42; comp. *Acts* iv. 35). It was not therefore "communion with St. Peter," as you would have us believe, but communion with the Apostles generally, that constituted Church membership. Furthermore, though there was one of the Apostles who bore rule over the Church of Jerusalem, that Apostle was not St. Peter, but St. James, the Lord's brother; the historical tradition which assigns this place to the latter,* being borne out by various circumstances which incidentally transpire in the narrative of the Acts.†

2. The healing of the impotent man is not the act of St. Peter alone, but of him and St. John conjointly, (*Acts* iii. 4, 11, 12; iv. 7, 9, 16); and although St. Peter was again the chief speaker,

* Euseb. Hist. Eccl. ii. 1.

† On his liberation from prison St. Peter desires the intelligence to be conveyed to "James and the brethren."—(*Acts* xii. 17). Again, on the occasion of the general assembly of the Church to deliberate upon the question of the circumcision of the Gentiles, St. Peter does indeed appear, and that in a prominent position, among the speakers, but he who delivers the sentence of the assembly, (ἐγὼ κρίνω, is

and his words alone are separately recorded, yet it appears that St. John also addressed both the people and the Sanhedrin, (*Acts* iv. 1—3; 19, 20); and throughout the transaction there is no trace of any superiority or pre-eminence claimed or exercised by St. Peter.

3. The fact that St. Peter was employed in a special manner for the conversion of the first Gentiles, admits of more than one explanation. It may be attributed to the known character of St. Peter, as the most inflexible among all the Apostles on the subject of the levitical separation of Jews and Gentiles; his instrumentality in the incorporation of the first Gentiles in the common fold would operate, not only as a salutary check upon his own deeply rooted prejudices, (see *Gal.* ii. 11—14,) but would go far to reconcile the mind of the Jewish converts generally, who looked upon St. Peter as the champion of the Circumcision, (*Acts* xi. 2—18; xv. 7—12,) to a fact so much at variance with their preconceived notions. It may be, on the other hand, or rather at the same

the weighty expression,) afterwards embodied in the missive of the Church, is St. James.—(*Acts* xv. 6—29). St. James was the only Apostle, besides St. Peter, to whom St. Paul was introduced on his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, (*Acts* ix. 26, 27; *Gal.* i. 18, 19); and to St. James, in the presence of the other presbyters, did St. Paul make his report on his return to Jerusalem after his third great missionary tour.—(*Acts* xxi. 18, 19).

time, (for the two suppositions are not inconsistent with one another,) that the conversion of the first Gentiles by St. Peter is to be regarded as a fulfilment in part of the promise given to him by our Lord, "Upon this rock will I build my Church." For although it is undeniable that the other Apostles were according to Christ's appointment foundation stones of the Church, just as much as St. Peter, yet it is equally undeniable that there was a priority given to St. Peter in that appointment, and to this priority the leading part which he took at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and afterwards at Cæsarea, perfectly corresponds; the first-fruits, as it were, both of the Jewish and of the Gentile harvest being gathered in by his labours. But this priority in the labour of conversion, which St. Peter unquestionably had, does not involve a subsequent supremacy over the persons converted, not by himself only, but by all the Apostles; and against the notion of such a supremacy, even when viewed in reference to St. Peter himself only, (leaving the doctrine of its transmission, and that in the specific channel of the Roman Episcopacy, altogether out of the question,) there are certain insurmountable difficulties which must present themselves to every candid reader of Scripture. There was another Apostle who received a special commission to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, and that in a manner far

more striking than the vision by which St. Peter's mind was prepared for an event so shocking to all his prejudices, as the association of the Gentiles with the Jews in one common covenant of grace. Not only was the first call of St. Paul to the Apostleship marked by the personal interposition of the Lord of glory, and by a distinct appropriation to him of the work of conversion among the Gentiles, (*Acts* ix. 3—16; xxii. 6—21); but the very Gospel which he had to preach, with its accompanying ordinances, was given him by special revelation, (*Gal.* i. 11, 12; 1 *Cor.* xv. 3—8; xi. 23—26). So plain was the distinction between the extensive vocation of St. Paul, and the more limited one of St. Peter, and so unquestionable the grounds on which the former rested, that after full discussion St. Peter and the other Apostles acquiesced in the arrangement, which assigned to St. Paul the Apostleship of the uncircumcision, and limited the Apostleship of St. Peter to the circumcision, (*Gal.* ii. 6—9,) notwithstanding the priority or pre-eminence which St. Peter had previously enjoyed, of being made instrumental in the conversion of the first Gentiles.

4. As regards the connexion which the persecution and miraculous deliverance of St. Peter recorded in Acts xii. seem to have in your opinion with his supposed supremacy, I honestly confess that I cannot form even a conjecture as to what may

be your meaning. Upon the most careful perusal of the transaction I can see nothing in it, but that persecution for the truth's sake befell St. Peter, and that God granted him deliverance from it. But this St. Peter has in common with his fellow-apostles, and many other saints of God; and the narrative does not even establish a priority of suffering in the case of St. Peter, because what he suffered, was but the sequel to the martyrdom of James, the brother of John. (*Acts* xii. 1—3).

Thus, then, on attentive examination of all the Scriptures alleged by you in support of the supremacy of St. Peter, there remains not a shred of that mysterious texture of untold inferences, on which you have so complacently embroidered the proposition, that "the establishment of a Centre of Unity for his Church [in the person of St. Peter and his Roman successors] is briefly, but sufficiently declared by Christ." Sooth to say, you have hardly entitled yourself to a refutation: still, for your more entire satisfaction, suffer me to remind you how very incompatible it is with your notion of St. Peter's supremacy, that the apostle St. Paul should mention "James, Cephas, and John" conjointly, not even putting Cephas first, as "pillars" of the Church at Jerusalem, (*Gal.* ii. 9); that he should "withstand St. Peter to the face," (*ibid.* ii. 11); that he should speak, not of one chief Apostle, but generally of "the very chiefest

Apostles," and assert his own perfect equality with them, (2 *Cor.* xi. 5; xii. 11); that he should represent himself as burdened with "the care of all the Churches," (*ibid.* xi. 28,) and take upon himself to say, "So ordain I in all Churches," (1 *Cor.* vii. 17). What would not the successors of St. Peter give, to find such things written of their predecessor! Allow me farther to ask, how you account for the singular fact, that neither St. Paul in his epistle to the Romans, nor St. Peter in either of his epistles, nor St. John in his epistolary dedications of that book in which the destinies of the Church Catholic are recorded, should any where give the slightest hint of any "Centre of Unity" except Christ himself, or of any supremacy attached to the See of Rome, or of any prerogative of St. Peter over the other Apostles. Lastly, suffer me to remind you, that even if your assertion of the supremacy of St. Peter were as tenable, as it is manifestly untenable, you would yet be far from having made out your case in favour of the present occupant of the Roman See; for you would still have to prove, that the supremacy was intended to be transmitted; and even if that were granted, you would have to show, that the See of Rome, not the See of Jerusalem, or of Cæsarea, or any other See, was the channel through which the supremacy was appointed to descend. If you should ever again be tempted

to handle these questions, let me advise you to keep Scripture altogether out of view; for it is extremely unfortunate for your argument, that the only connexion between Rome and St. Peter to be traced in Scripture, is the very doubtful interpretation of the supposed date of his first Epistle, (1 *Pet.* v. 13,) which, if it be decided in favour of Rome, at once identifies her with Babylon, upon whose forehead this name is written: "Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." (*Rev.* xvii. 5). Besides, you seem not to be aware to what extent you bring the character of St. Peter himself, to say nothing of the consistency of the Roman See, into a dilemma quite as perplexing as that in which you imagine that you have placed the present Metropolitan of Canterbury. Suppose St. Peter, Gregory VII., and Gregory XVI. were to meet, and spy out one another's liberty; the two Gregories would be under the very painful necessity of visiting St. Peter with their ecclesiastical censures, as a *sacerdos concubinarius;* for it is well known that St. Peter was, *proh pudor!* a married man.

Entirely deserted as you are in this, the cardinal point of your whole theory, by the evidence of Scripture, where next will you take refuge? In the testimony of the early Fathers, in the re-

cords of ecclesiastical history? Be it so; here also I am quite ready to meet you.

Let us turn first to CLEMENT, whom Rome reckons among her earliest bishops. We have an epistle of his written to the Corinthian Church, on an occasion which was peculiarly well calculated to bring that supreme authority, of which in your hypothesis he was possessed, into salutary exercise for the suppression of the disorders which distracted the Church of Corinth. There is not one single passage in the whole of that epistle, which gives the slightest colour to the supposition, that Rome was then "the Centre of Unity," and her Bishop the "Supreme Head" of the Church Catholic. On the contrary, the reference which he makes to the Apostolic succession in the different Churches of the earth, directly negatives that supposition:

"The Apostles were gospelled forth unto us from the Lord Jesus Christ, and Jesus, the Christ, from God. Christ, therefore, was sent forth from God, and the Apostles from Christ: both, consequently, proceeded in order from the will of God. Having therefore received his commands, and being fully assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and confirmed in the word of God, with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth gospelling the coming of God's Kingdom. Thus preaching *through countries and cities, they constituted their first-fruits, having proved them by the Spirit,*

Overseers and Ministers of those that should believe."—Clement. Ep. ad Cor. c. xlii.

"Our Apostles knew, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there would be contention concerning the title of the Oversight. For this reason, therefore, having received perfect foreknowledge, *they appointed the aforesaid* [i. e. *Overseers and Ministers*], *and gave them pastoral authority next after, that when they should have fallen asleep, other approved men might succeed to their ministry."—Ibid. c.* xliv.

In this account of the succession of Ministers according to Apostolic appointment, there is a remarkable absence, it must be allowed, of all "perception" whatever, clear or unclear, of the "designed succession to St. Peter," which in one so near to St. Peter in the succession, as Clement was, is not a little singular.

Another venerable witness of antiquity, IGNATIUS, who had no mean conception of the Christian hierarchy, is equally unconscious of the alleged subjection of the Churches of the earth, and of their Bishops, to the Roman successor of St. Peter. Not the least trace of such a notion is to be found in any of his epistles, one of which is addressed to the Roman Church; on the contrary, it is evident throughout, that he considers the Bishop in each Church as the representative of the Chief Shepherd, Christ Jesus.

"Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the mind of the Father, as also *the Bishops ordained within their re-*

spective limits [or, as some interpret, supplying τῆς γῆς, through the uttermost parts of the earth] *are the mind of Jesus Christ.* Whence it becometh you, to concur with the mind of the Bishop, which also ye do. For your presbytery, justly renowned and worthy of God, is so harmoniously attached to the Bishop, as the strings are to the lyre."—*Ignat. Ep. ad Ephes. c.* iii. iv.

"Study to be partakers of one Eucharist: for there is *one flesh* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and *one cup* unto oneness of his blood; *one altar,* as also *one Bishop,* together with the Presbytery and the Deacons."—*Ignat. Ep. ad Philad. c.* iv.

"Flee divisions, as the beginning of evils. *Follow ye all the Bishop, even as Jesus Christ the Father,* and the Presbytery as the Apostles; and reverence the Deacons as the ordinance of God. Let no one *apart from the Bishop* do any of the things belonging to the Church. Let that Eucharist be esteemed valid, which is *under the Bishop, or the bearer of his commission. Where the Bishop is to be found, there let the congregation be; even as where Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church.* It is not lawful *apart from the Bishop* to baptize, or to celebrate communion; but *what he approves, that is also well-pleasing to God;* to the intent that all which is done, may be sure and valid. . . . . *He who honours the Bishop, is honoured by God;* he who does any thing clandestinely, *unknown to the Bishop,* does service to the Devil."—*Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. c.* viii. ix.

"*Have regard to the Bishop,* that God also may have regard to you."—*Ignat. Ep. ad Polyc. c.* vi.

"Beware then of such, [heretics]. And thus it will be with you, if ye be not puffed up, if ye remain *inseparable from Jesus Christ our God, and from the Bishop,*

and from the ordinances of the Apostles. He who is within the altar, is clean; that is to say, he is not clean in his conscience, who does aught *apart from the Bishop*, and the Presbytery, and the Deacon."—*Ignat. Ep. ad Trall. c.* vii.

"As many as are of God and of Jesus Christ, the same are *with the Bishop;* and as many as, repenting, shall come to *the Unity of the Church*, they also shall be of God."—*Ignat. Ep. ad Philad. c.* iii.

"If ye be *subject to the Bishop as unto Jesus Christ*, then do you appear to me as living not according to man, but according to Jesus Christ."—*Ignat. Ep. ad Trall. c.* ii.

"Study to do all things in the concord of God; *the Bishop presiding in the place of God*, and the Presbyters in the place of the council of the Apostles; and the Deacons, to me most dear, being entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ."—*Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. c.* vi.

"The Bishop, it is clear, is to be regarded even as the Lord himself."—*Ignat. Ep. ad Ephes. c.* vi.

What is it, that is here pressed upon the different Churches as "the Centre of Unity," the preservative against schism and heresy? Not, assuredly, obedience on the part of all the Churches and Bishops of the earth to the Roman "successor of St. Peter," but obedience on the part of the Churches, severally, to their Bishops, derived in order of succession from the Apostles. The terms in which Ignatius throughout speaks of these Bishops, their dignity and authority in their respective Churches, "annihilates" the notion that

they owed any other allegiance but to the Chief Shepherd, glorified in heaven.

Let us next consult POLYCARP, the friend of Ignatius. From the epistle which we have under his name, nothing can be inferred on either side of the question. But there is a transaction connected with his name, which may serve to give us an insight into his view of the independence of his own Church and Episcopate. It is thus recorded by Irenæus:

"The blessed Polycarp having come to Rome in the days of Anicetus, when concerning some other things they had slight differences, they forthwith made peace; and on this head also [the time for celebrating Easter] they were not contentious towards each other. For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe [his custom respecting Easter], seeing that he had ever observed it with John the disciple of our Lord, and with the other Apostles with whom he had been associated; nor did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it, who said, that he must retain the custom of the Presbyters that went before him. And this being the case, they communicated with each other; and in the church Anicetus yielded up to Polycarp the eucharistic service, in evident token of respect; and they parted from each other in peace; all the church, both those who did, and those who did not observe [the Quartodeciman custom,] being at peace with each other."—*Iren. Ep. ad Vict. ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* v. 24.

From this transaction, as related by Irenæus,

it is evident, that Polycarp and Anicetus considered and treated each other as equals; and as such discussed their differences in a spirit of Christian charity. Had there been a supremacy in the Roman See, Polycarp's plea would have been manifestly insufficient, and the position which he assumed, untenable. As it is, he appeals to his own independent Apostolic succession, derived from St. John; thus affording the strongest possible confirmation of the view which the epistles of Ignatius give us, of an independent Apostolic succession of Bishops throughout the Churches of the earth.

The same view runs through the writings of IRENÆUS, the disciple of Polycarp, one of whose chief arguments against the heretics derives its very point and force from the fact, that the different Churches of the earth, having derived their faith independently of each other, through the succession of their Bishops from the Apostles, agree in the confession of one Catholic faith, and form but one Catholic Church.

"Wherefore the Presbyters that are in the Church are to be obeyed, *those who have their succession from the Apostles,* as we have shown; who with the succession of the Episcopate have received the sure spiritual gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father: and the others who are removed from the original succession, and form sects in every place, are to be had

in suspicion, either as heretics and of unsound mind, or as schismatics, high minded and self-pleasers; or again as hypocrites, doing these things for gain and vain-glory."—*Iren. adv. Hær.* iv. 26.

"All these [heretics] are much later than *the Bishops to whom the Apostles have committed the Churches.* . . . . The said heretics being blind to the truth, are compelled to wander deviously through one and another course, and on this account the tracks of their doctrine are scattered about in an inconsistent and incoherent manner. Whereas the pathway of those who are of the Church, goeth round the whole world, *holding fast the tradition from the Apostles, and enabling us to see that the faith of all is one and the same;* all teaching one and the same God the Father, and believing in the same dispensation of the incarnation of the Son of God, and knowing the same gift of the Spirit; and minding the same commands, and preserving the same form of order as regards the Church; and looking for the same advent of the Lord, and maintaining the same salvation of the whole man, that is of body and soul. True and stedfast is *the preaching of the Church, in which one and the same way of salvation is shown throughout the whole world.*"—*Ibid.* v. 20.

Nothing can be clearer, than that the argument of Irenæus in these and many other similar passages would wholly fail, if the unity of the Church Catholic were not the result of a consonant profession of one and the same faith by many Churches, independently derived by succession from the Apostles throughout the world, but

rested on the supremacy of one central Church over all the rest. The very passage in which the Romanists affect to find a testimony to the existence of that supremacy in the days of Irenæus, is, when taken in its connexion with the general argument of which it forms a part, pointedly to the same effect. After complaining of the heretics,—because when refuted out of the Scriptures, they pretended to have recourse to tradition; and when "challenged upon the ground of the tradition *derived from the Apostles, and preserved in the Churches by their respective successions of presbyters,*" they set themselves against tradition, and laid claim to superiority of knowledge, not over the presbyters only, but over the Apostles themselves,—he thus continues :—

"The tradition therefore of the Apostles, which is made manifest in the whole world, is open, in the whole Church, to the view of all who desire to see the truth; and we are able to *enumerate those who were set as Bishops in the Churches by the Apostles, and their successors to our time,* who have neither taught nor known any thing resembling the insane conceits of these men. For if the Apostles had been acquainted with hidden mysteries, in which they instructed the perfect only, secretly and apart from the rest, they would have handed them down first and foremost to *those to whom they committed the Churches themselves.* For they would have *those whom they appointed their successors, giving to them their own chief station,* to be very perfect and unblamable in all things; as those from whose correct

conduct much profit, and from their fall much mischief, must ensue. But as it would be extremely lengthy, in such a volume as this, to enumerate *the successions of all the Churches*, we confound all those who in any way, either through conceit, or through vain-glory, or through blindness and an unsound mind, establish sects, by pointing to the tradition, and the faith proclaimed unto mankind, of that greatest, and most ancient, and universally known Church, which was founded and settled at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul; whose tradition and faith, derived from the Apostles, has come down to us through the succession of Bishops. For with this Church, on account of its superior pre-eminence,* the whole Church, that is, the faithful in all the world, must of necessity agree; the tradition derived from the Apostles having ever been preserved in the Church *by the faithful in all the world.*"—*Iren. adv. Hær.* iii. 3.

What is the purport of all this? Irenæus maintains that the faith handed down in all the Churches of the earth by their bishops descended

* "*Propter potiorem principalitatem*," says the barbarous Latin interpreter. What Irenæus himself may have said, it is impossible now to ascertain. Taking, however, the expression "*potior principalitas*" at the utmost valuation which it will bear,—and you will admit I have given it its full weight by rendering it "superior pre-eminence,"—what does it amount to? Deplorable indeed must be that dearth of evidence which compels the Romanists to treasure, with as much triumph and anxiety as they have shown on the occasion, these two words "*potiorem principalitatem*," as *the only trace of the Roman supremacy discoverable in the two first centuries of the Christian era!*

in succession from the Apostles, affords one uniform testimony against the heretics. The very point of his argument is the agreement of all the Churches throughout the world; an agreement which can have weight in support of his position only in the event of its being the coincidence of traditional faith separately and independently derived, along with the episcopal succession, not from one supreme Church, or from one chief Apostle, but from the Apostles preaching one and the same Gospel, and committing it as a deposit of truth, to the different Churches throughout the world. Finding it, however, impracticable to enumerate all these Churches, with their Apostolic succession of bishops, he makes his choice of one; and in so doing he naturally takes that one, whose conspicuous position sufficiently protected him from the imputation of having adduced the traditional faith of some obscure Church, from which, for aught that appeared to the contrary, other Churches might differ in some point or other. Such an objection could not lie against the testimony of the Roman Church; it was a necessary consequence of her position, that what she proclaimed to the world as the Catholic faith, must long ago have been contradicted by other Churches, if it were not so. This is evidently all that Irenæus means; and greatly would he have been astonished, if he had lived to see his

statement of the distinguished place which the Roman Church then *de facto* occupied, brought forward as a proof, that the Roman Church had *jure divino*, from the first and for ever, a supremacy over all the Churches of Christendom, and an absolute dominion over their faith.* A further proof that Irenæus intended only to adduce the Roman Church as one case of many which he might have adduced, is furnished by the fact, that after recounting the succession and the faith of the Roman Church, he brings forward the faith of the Asiatic Churches who derived their suc-

* "It is not altogether matter of conjecture what judgment Irenæus would have formed of such claims as those preferred in later times by the Roman Church. After applying to the heretics and schismatics spoken of in my first extract (see above pp. 23, 24) the examples of Nadab and Abihu, of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and of Jeroboam, he thus adverts to another class of perverters of the truth:

"But such as are by many accounted Presbyters, (let it be borne in mind, that under this term Irenæus includes Bishops,) who nevertheless serve their own lusts, and set not before them in their hearts the fear of God, but *treat the others* [their fellow-Presbyters, their brother-Bishops] *with contumely, and are puffed up with the pride of conceded pre-eminence*, and do wickedness in secret, saying 'None seeth us,' shall be confounded by the Word, who judgeth not after 'the sight of the eyes,' and 'looketh not on the outward appearance, but on the heart;' and they shall hear these words of the prophet Daniel, [*i. e.* the history of Susanna,] 'O thou seed of Chanaan and not of Judah, beauty hath deceived thee, and lust hath perverted thine heart; O thou that art waxen old in wickedness, now thy

cession through Polycarp, and that of the Church of Ephesus, as further examples, on a par with that of the Roman Church. He closes his account of the latter with these words,

"By this order and succession the Apostolic tradition and preaching of the truth in the Church, has come down to us."

and then adds:

"And Polycarp also, who was not only instructed by the Apostles, and had associated with many that had seen Christ, but was also appointed by the Apostles bishop over Asia, in the church of Smyrna, whom we

---

sins which thou hast committed aforetime, are come to light; for *thou hast pronounced false judgment, and hast condemned the innocent, and hast let the guilty go free;* albeit the Lord saith, 'The innocent and righteous shalt thou not slay.' Of whom also the Lord hath said: 'But and *if that evil servant shall say in his heart, 'My Lord delayeth his coming, and shall begin to beat the men-servants and maidens, and to eat and drink and to be drunken;'* the Lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers.' *From all such, therefore, we ought to turn away;* and to cleave to those who, as we said before, both *preserve the doctrine of the Apostles*, and, along with the order of the Presbytery, *show sound speech and a conversation without offence*, for confirmation and rebuke of others."

These are precisely the principles upon which the Anglican Church stands aloof from the Roman communion, notwithstanding the acknowledged regularity and validity of her succession.

also have seen in our early youth, (for he continued long, and departed this life quite an old man, being nobly and gloriously martyred,) always taught these things, which he had learned from the Apostles, which he also delivered to the Church, and which alone are true. To the same things likewise all the Churches of Asia, and the successors of Polycarp to this day, bear witness. . . . . In like manner also the Church of Ephesus, founded by Paul, with whom John continued till the time of Trajan, is a true witness of the Apostolic tradition."—*Iren. l. c.*

This view of the case is still farther borne out by the remarks of Irenæus in the next following chapter :

" There being, then, such proofs, we ought no longer to seek among others that truth which it is easy to take from the Church, since the Apostles have most abundantly laid up in her, as in a rich treasury, whatever is of the truth ; that whosoever will, may take from her the drink of life. For she is the entrance to life ; all the others are thieves and robbers. Wherefore we ought to avoid them ; but with greatest diligence to love those that are Churches, and to apprehend the tradition of the truth. For why ? If there should be difference of opinion respecting some less important question, ought we not in that case to have recourse to *the most ancient Churches, in which the Apostles were conversant, and to take from them what is certain and plain concerning the matter in hand ?* Again, suppose the Apostles had left us no Scriptures, must we not in that case have followed the order of tradition which they delivered to *those to whom they committed the*

Churches? To this order *many nations among those barbarians who believe in Christ,* agree, having, without paper and ink, salvation written by the Spirit in their hearts, *and diligently keeping the old tradition,* believing in one God, &c. &c. . . . They who have believed this faith without letters, are as concerning our speech, barbarians; but as concerning their doctrine, and custom, and conversation, they are on account of their faith most wise, and please God, walking in all righteousness, and chastity, and wisdom."—*Iren. adv. Hær.* iii. 4.

One more extract will set into full light the ground on which, according to Irenæus, the unity of the Church Catholic rests:

"The Church having received *this preaching and this faith,* although she be scattered abroad in the whole world, yet carefully preserves the same, as though dwelling in one house; she *alike believes* in these things, as though having one soul and one heart; she *concordantly preaches, and teaches, and hands down* these things, as though having one mouth; for although the languages throughout the world are unlike, yet the import of the tradition is one and the same. Neither the Churches established in Germany hold or hand down a different faith, nor those in Spain, Gaul, the East, Egypt, or Africa, nor those established in the middle regions of the world: but as the sun, God's creature, is one and the same in the whole world, so *the preaching of the truth shineth every where, and lighteth all men who are willing to come to the knowledge of the truth.*"—*Iren. adv. Hær.* i. 10.

Not the supremacy, therefore, of one Church,

but the consent of all the Churches of the earth in the one truth committed to them all, is, according to the notion of Irenæus, the foundation of Catholicity ; whence it follows, that the Catholic character of a Church cannot be forfeited by the mere cessation of communion between her and any other Church, but only by her departure from Catholic truth and Apostolic order. Let the Roman Church honestly examine the grounds on which communion between herself and other Churches has ceased, and she will soon discover that her faith is no longer, as it was in the days of Irenæus, the Catholic faith, as a matter of course.

How far Irenæus was from acknowledging a supremacy in the Roman Church and Bishop over the Churches of the earth, we may further infer from the part he took in the Quartodeciman controversy. In common with other bishops he addressed a spirited remonstrance to Victor, when he proposed to excommunicate the Asiatic Churches on account of their refusal to comply with the Roman computation of Easter. And not only did Irenæus, in the name and on behalf of a council of Gallican bishops, so remonstrate, but he felt himself at liberty to address to the bishops of other Churches letters on the same subject, in opposition to the views of the Roman Bishop; and thereby doubtless contributed in no small degree to that opposition which Victor's

uncharitable spirit encountered from all quarters; as Eusebius testifies, who saw the letters addressed to him, and speaks of them as containing most severe strictures upon him.*

I have gone thus fully into the views of Irenæus, in order to expose the utter untenableness of the position which Romanist writers have endeavoured to build upon two words, in themselves of doubtful meaning, and incapable of the construction attempted to be put upon them by the advocates of the Papacy, without doing violence to the whole argument of Irenæus from first to last. Additional proof of the correctness of the view I have taken, will present itself in the sequel.

On the writers of the Alexandrian school, whose mystical tendency greatly diminishes the value of their testimony, especially on a question like the present, I need not enlarge. Suffice it to observe, that CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA knows of no other unity of the one primitive and Catholic Church, except that founded upon concurrence in the one universal faith; † and that his disciple ORIGEN, so far from admitting an exclusive appropriation to St. Peter (to say nothing of his alleged successors) of the passage, "*Thou art Peter*," &c., on the contrary applies it to all true believers in Christ.

* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. v. 24. † Clem. Alex. Strom. l. vii.

"If you suppose the whole Church to be built by God upon that one Peter alone, what will you say concerning John the son of Thunder, or every other Apostle? Is it meant, that we should make bold to assert that against Peter individually the gates of hell shall not prevail, but against the other Apostles and against the perfect they shall prevail? Does not this saying, 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it,' come to pass upon them all, and upon each one of them? and so likewise the saying 'Upon this rock I will build my Church?' Again, are the keys of the kingdom of heaven given by the Lord to Peter alone, and shall none other of the blessed obtain them? But if this saying, 'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' is common to the others also, why not all that precedes and follows, as addressed to Peter? For in this place the words, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven,' appear to be spoken as unto Peter; and yet in the Gospel according to John, the Saviour giving the Holy Spirit to his disciples by breathing on them, saith: 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained' . . . . . If any one say this [thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God] unto Him, not by revelation of flesh and blood, but of the heavenly Father, he shall obtain the things spoken, as the letter of the Gospel says, to that individual Peter, but, as the Spirit of it teaches, to every one who becomes such as Peter was."—*Origen. Comm. in Matth.* tom. xii. § 11.

The next witness whom I shall cite, is TERTULLIAN. Of the foundation of the Church Catholic he gives the following description :—

" The Apostles having, upon the warrant of the prophecy in the Psalms of David, taken Matthias, by lot, into their number, as the twelfth, in the place of Judas, and having received the promised power of the Holy Ghost for miracles and utterance, first witnessed the faith in Jesus Christ, and founded Churches, throughout Judæa; after which they went forth into the world, and both preached the same doctrine of the same faith to the Gentiles, and likewise founded in every city Churches, from which other Churches subsequently borrowed, and daily continue to borrow, the layer of faith and the seed of doctrine, in order to become Churches ; and by this means are themselves also reckoned Apostolic Churches, as being the offspring of Apostolic Churches. Every kind must necessarily be referred to its original. *So many, therefore, and so great Churches constitute that one primitive Church which is from the Apostles, and of which all are. Thus are they all the primitive Church, and all Apostolic Churches, while they all with one consent make proof of their unity.*"—*Tertull. de Præscr. Hæret. c.* xx.

Upon this statement, in which you will observe all the Churches founded by any of the Apostles in any part of the world are put on an equality, Tertullian founds the test which he proposes for distinguishing true doctrine from heresy :

" What they [the Apostles] preached, that is, what Christ revealed to them, is *not to be proved in any other*

way, except through the same Churches, which the Apostles themselves founded, preaching to them in person, both orally, and afterwards by their epistles. If these things be so, then it is plain, that *every doctrine which accords with those Apostolic Churches,* the matrices and originals of faith, is to be accounted for truth; as maintaining without doubt *that which the Churches received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ,* and Christ from God; and that on the contrary every doctrine is at once to be judged untrue, whose savour is opposed to *the truth of the Churches, and of the Apostles,* and of Christ, and of God."—*Ibid. c.* xxi.

Not a trace here of any disparity among the Churches, nor of any supremacy given to one over the rest. It is the common consent of all the Churches, not agreement with one supreme Church and her visible Head, which constitutes the test of the Catholic faith. And again to the same effect is the test proposed for ascertaining the Catholic and Apostolic character of individual Churches; not their communion with one supreme Church and her visible Head, but their Apostolic descent:—

"Let them produce the origins of their Churches; let them exhibit the order of their Bishops, so descending by succession from the beginning, that the first Bishop shall have *one of the Apostles, or some one of the Apostolic men,* who continued for a time with the Apostles, for *his predecessor and the fountain of his authority.* For in this way the Apostolic Churches carry

down their registers: as, for instance, the Church of Smyrna brings forward Polycarp, appointed by John; the Church of Rome in like manner Clement, ordained by Peter. Even so the other Churches likewise show what men, appointed to the Episcopate by the Apostles, they had for propagators of the Apostolic seed."—*Ibid.* c. xxxii.

Nor is this test limited to the succession; doctrine is applied in the same way, and precisely upon the same principles:—

"Thus [by their doctrine] shall they [the heretics] be tried by those Churches, which although they cannot trace their origin back to any of the Apostles or Apostolic men, (as those that are of much later date, and those which are daily being established,) yet agreeing in the same faith, are no less *accounted Apostolic, on account of consanguinity of doctrine.*"—*Ibid.* c. xxxii.

The inquirer after truth, whose mind has been perplexed by the assertions of heretics, is not sent to Rome, as being the "sole authorized claimant of God's favour and heritage:" a very different method of satisfying his thirst for knowledge, is recommended by Tertullian:

"Go the round of *the Apostolic Churches, where the chairs of the Apostles themselves yet maintain their pre-eminence in their respective places;* in whom their authentic letters are still read, sounding with the voice, and representing the face, of each. Art thou in the neighbourhood of Achaia? Thou hast Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi

and the Thessalonians. If thou canst go as far as Asia, thou hast Ephesus. *If thou art close to Italy, Rome,* whence we [the African Churches] have our authority near at hand.* How happy is that Church! into whom the Apostles poured their whole doctrine, together with their blood; where Peter was made like unto the passion of our Lord; where Paul was crowned with John's death; where the Apostle John being thrown into boiling oil, had no hurt, and was banished into an island."—*Ibid. c.* xxxvi. comp. *Adv. Marcion. l.* iv. *c.* 5.

However glowing the eulogy which Tertullian passes upon the Roman Church, however reverent his estimation of her as the mother of the African Churches, still he does not exalt her above measure, but leaves her to take rank, in point of dignity and authority, with other Churches

* Possibly this may refer to an ecclesiastical superintendence similar to that afterwards known under the name of the Patriarchate, exercised by Rome over the African Churches; the different primitive or apostolic Sees, that is, those over which Apostles had in person presided, retaining for the most part some measure of superiority over the Churches planted by them. Considering, however, the context, Tertullian's meaning more probably is, that if the African Churches be asked concerning the orthodox derivation of their faith, or the Apostolic succession of their Bishops, they would point to Rome as their Mother Church, and one of the primitive Apostolic Churches; so that they had not far to go, to authenticate either their doctrine or their ministrations. That the passage gives no countenance whatever to the alleged universal supremacy of Rome, is too obvious to need any remark.

of Apostolic foundation, such as Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus, and others. The view thus given by Tertullian of the ancient Church Catholic, and of the position occupied in her by the Roman Church, is abundantly confirmed by the evidence of his admirer CYPRIAN, who may well be called the champion of Catholic freedom. His evidence is the more remarkable, as it is not confined to an exhibition of the theoretical views which were entertained in his days of the origin and constitution of the Church, but affords an illustration of the principles on which encroachments on the liberties of the Catholic Church, infinitely more moderate than those subsequently attempted by Rome, were resisted by the independent Bishops of that early age. We have from his pen a treatise on the Unity of the Church, in which he opens his argument by a reference to two of those passages, on which you rely for your Scriptural demonstration of the Supremacy of Rome; viz. *Matth.* xvi. 18, 19; and *John* xxi. 16, 17. So far, however, from founding on these passages the assertion of one Supreme Episcopate, vested in the Bishop of Rome, he does not even mention the Roman Church or Bishop, but on the contrary labours throughout the whole treatise to establish the essential oneness of that Catholic Episcopate, of which the Bishops of the different Churches of the earth are, as it were,

joint-possessors and co-trustees. But he shall speak for himself. Having quoted the above mentioned passages, he thus continues:—

"Upon One He builds his Church. And although *He gives to all the Apostles like power, saying,* 'As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained;'—yet, to manifest the unity, He appointed by his authority that the origin of this unity should begin from one individual. *Most certainly the other Apostles were even the same as Peter, endued with like fellowship both of honour and of power;* but the beginning proceeds from Unity, that the Church might be shown to be one; which one Church the Holy Ghost also designates in the Song of Songs, where speaking in the character of the Lord, he saith: 'My dove, my undefiled is but one: she is the only one of her mother, she is the choice one of her that bare her.'

"He who does not hold to this Unity of the Church, does he imagine that he holds the faith? He who opposes himself, and resists the Church, does he venture to think that he is in the Church? seeing that the blessed Apostle Paul also teaches the same, and sets forth the mystery of the unity, saying; 'One body and one spirit, one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God.' *This Unity we are bound firmly to maintain and to defend, especially we Bishops who bear rule in the Church, that we may make proof of the Episcopate itself also, as being one and undivided.* Let no one by lying deceive the brotherhood; no one by perfidious prevarication corrupt the truth of the faith.

*The Episcopate is one, shared in common by the individual Bishops as its joint-possessors:** the Church also is one, but through the increase of her fruitfulness more widely expanded in point of multitude."—*Cyprian. de Unit. Eccles.* p. 107, 108. Ed. Oxon. 1682.

The same interpretation of our Saviour's address to St. Peter, applying it to the Episcopate generally, occurs repeatedly in his epistles:

"Our Lord, whose commands we are bound to fear and to observe, *appointing the Episcopal dignity and the constitution of his Church,* saith in the Gospel, speaking unto Peter: 'I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.' *Thence the ordinance of Bishops and the constitution of the Church descends* through the changes of times and successions; so that *the Church is built upon the Bishops,* and every act of the Church governed by those its rulers. This, therefore, being the foundation laid by the law of God, I am surprised that some [of the lapsed] should have had the audacity to address a letter to me as in the name of the Church; seeing that *the Church consists of the Bishop and Clergy, and all that do stand."—Cyprian. Ep.* xxxiii.

---

* *Episcopatus unus est, cujus* A SINGULIS IN SOLIDUM *pars tenetur.*

"Whither shall he come who thirsteth? To the heretics, where there is no fountain or river of living water whatever? or to the Church which is one, and is by the word of the Lord built upon one, who also received the keys of it? This is the one Church who has and possesses the whole power of her bridegroom and her Lord; in her *we* bear rule; for her honour and unity *we* fight, her grace as well as glory *we* defend by the power of faith. *We, by divine commission,* water the thirsting people of God, *we* guard the approaches of the living fountains."—*Cyprian. Ep.* lxxiii. p. 202, 203.

In like manner the idea of the one Episcopate held by all the Bishops conjointly, again occurs:

"Whereas the one Church is by Christ divided throughout the world into many members, and *the Episcopate is one, diffused through the concordant numerosity of many Bishops,* he [Novatian] attempts to set up a human Church, when there is a divine succession, and a connected and universally rivetted unity of the Church Catholic."—*Cyprian. Ep.* lv. p. 112.

In perfect consistency with this view, Cyprian considers the Bishops of the different Churches to be the successors and vicegerents of the Apostles, holding their power and dignity by divine right:—

"The Deacons ought to remember, that *the Apostles, that is to say the Bishops and Rulers,* were chosen by the Lord; but the Deacons were, after our Lord's ascension into heaven, appointed by the Apostles, to be

servants of their Episcopate and of the Church. If we may oppose *God who makes the Bishops*, then may the Deacons oppose us by whom they are made."—*Cypr. Ep.* iii.

"This, brother,* is and ought to be our utmost endeavour, to maintain, as far as in us lies, *the unity handed down, from the Lord, and through the Apostles, to us their successors.*"—*Cyprian. Ep.* xlv.

"It is Peter, upon whom the Church was built, that speaks in these words, [*John* vi. 68, 69,] teaching and showing in the name of the Church, that although the contumacious and proud multitude of the disobedient depart, yet the Church does not go back from Christ; but that the Church are the people united to the priest, the flock adhering to its pastor. Whence you ought to understand, that *the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the Bishop:* and that, *if any are not with the Bishop, they are not in the Church.*"—*Cyprian. Ep.* lxvi. p. 168.

In the exercise of their high functions, Cyprian considers the different Bishops to be, within the limits of their respective dioceses, perfectly free and independent, responsible to God alone. On the important point of the validity of heretical baptism, he thus writes to his "brother Jubaianus:"

---

* The letter is addressed to Cornelius, the then occupant of the Roman See. The tone of perfect equality in which Cyprian speaks in his numerous letters to the Roman Bishops of his time, would of itself be sufficient to negative the supposition of Rome's supremacy.

"We have thus shortly replied to you, dear brother, according to our poor ability, not as prejudging, or laying down the law for any one, so as to prevent *any Bishop from doing what to him seemeth good, each being at perfect liberty to act according to his own discretion.* We do not, as far as in us lies, contend, for the sake of the heretics, with our colleagues and brother-bishops, with whom we maintain divine concord, and the peace of the Lord; especially since the Apostle saith: 'But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Church of God.' With patience and firmness we preserve charity of mind, the respect due between colleagues, the bond of faith, the concord of the Priesthood."—*Cyprian. Ep.* lxxiii. p. 209, 210.

Still more remarkable is the following passage from a letter relative to the same much-disputed question, addressed by Cyprian on his own behalf, and in the name of the African Church, to Stephen, the then Bishop of Rome, who was violently opposed to the decisions of the Council of Carthage on this subject:—

"We have urged these things upon your conscience, dear brother, both for mutual regard's sake and out of sincere affection, believing that you also will, in true piety and faith, approve that which is alike agreeable to godliness and truth. We are aware, however, that some, unwilling to lay aside the opinion they have once taken up, are not easily induced to alter their determination;*

* This appears to be a gentle hint to Stephen himself, whose temper was not displayed to much advantage in this

but retain certain peculiarities once become customary with them, yet *without violation of the bond of peace and concord between colleagues.* Wherein we also do not constrain any man, or lay down the law for him; forasmuch as *in the Government of the Church every Bishop has perfect liberty to exercise his own discretion, seeing he will have to give an account of his doings to the Lord.*" —*Cyprian. Ep.* lxxii.

To the same effect, and with an evident allusion to the inclination which Stephen showed to lord it over his brother-bishops, did Cyprian express himself in his opening address to the Council held at Carthage on the question of heretical baptism, in which he presided:—

"It remains that we should one by one deliver our opinions on this subject; not judging any one, nor ex-

---

controversy. From another letter of Cyprian to one of the African bishops, we learn that he felt himself not a little aggrieved by the "obstinacy" of his brother Stephen. (*Ep.* lxxiv. p. 214). Still more unceremonious is the language of Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, who in a letter to Cyprian on the same subject, expresses his "just indignation at the palpable and manifest stupidity of Stephen," admitting the validity of heretical baptism, and thereby, according to Firmilian's view, acknowledging the heretical sects as Churches; an inconsistency the more striking, because, says Firmilian, "*he boasts about the place of his Episcopate, and contends that he has the succession of Peter;*" and again, "*he alleges that he occupies the chair of Peter by succession.*"—(*Firmil. Ep. ad Cyprian.* lxxv. *in Cypr. Epp.* p. 225.) A strange specimen this of the "universal estimation" in which the "primacy of the chair of St. Peter" was held in the third century!

cluding any one from the privilege of communion, if he think differently. For no one among us *constitutes himself a Bishop of Bishops, or wishes to force his colleagues into compliance by tyrannical threats;* seeing that *every Bishop has a right to exercise his own discretion, to the full extent of his freedom and power; and can no more be judged by another, than himself pass judgment upon another.* But let us all await the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, *who alone and exclusively has the power of setting us over the government of his Church, and of passing judgment upon our proceedings.*"*—*Concil. Carthag.* iii. *Proloq. S. Cypriani.*

It must, I think, be very obvious to you, that I can have no temptation whatever to deprive you of the benefit of that passage in which Cyprian applies to the Roman Church the term *principalis ecclesia;*† on the contrary that pas-

* For further evidence on the independent jurisdiction of the Bishops, maintained by Cyprian, see *Epp.* lv. p. 110; lvii. p. 119; lxix. p. 188.

† The passage occurs in a letter from Cyprian to the Roman Bishop Cornelius, written on the occasion of an attempt made by the schismatic Fortunatus and his partisans to gain Cornelius over to their side, in their dispute with Cyprian. "They have the audacity," he says, "to convey a letter from schismatical and profane persons to the Chair of Peter, and to the principal Church, whence priestly unity has taken its commencement; not reflecting that those to whom they went, were Romans, whose faith is praised by the Apostle, and to whom treachery can find no access."—*Ep.* lix. p. 136. It is hardly necessary to observe, that the "Chair of Peter" was not accounted a "Supreme See," in an age in which, as has been abun-

sage, taken in connexion with Cyprian's repeated and most unqualified assertion of the independent succession and authority of the different Sees of the Church Catholic, most strongly confirms the view which I have taken of the import of the terms *potior principalitas* in the much-debated passage of Irenæus. The fact is, that the Roman Church did, at an early period, obtain a certain kind of pre-eminence among the Churches of Christendom, as the natural consequence of her location in the imperial city, the then metropolis of the world. Nor are proofs wanting that some of the Bishops of that Church were imbued in no small degree with that spirit of universal interference and in-

dantly shown, all Churches who had "Apostolic Chairs," whether of Peter or any other Apostle, at Rome or elsewhere, enjoyed a superior degree of honour. The remark concerning "priestly unity" may possibly have reference to the successful manner in which Cornelius had, some time previously, put an end at Rome to a schism similar to, and connected with, that by which the Church of Carthage was at this time troubled, and in reference to which this letter of Cyprian was written. But even supposing it to allude to the growing authority of the Roman Bishop among the Churches of the West, its application could never exceed the limits of what was afterwards the Roman Patriarchate, and even within those limits it can never be construed into a proof of the existence of such a supremacy as has since been claimed by and for the Roman Bishops, in the teeth of Cyprian's plain statements as to the origin of the Catholic Episcopate, and the independence of all bishops having Apostolic descent.

solent domination, which formed the basis of the Roman character, and manifested itself not more strongly in the political oppression of the world by pagan Rome, than in the spiritual despotism imposed by Christian Rome upon the Church Catholic, to the utmost extent that her peculiar advantages, and opportune circumstances, would at any time allow. But the question is not, how great was the lust of power which filled the heart, or marked the course, of this or that Roman Bishop; nor how great the advantages which the metropolitan character of the Roman city, and the vast extent of the Roman empire, afforded for the exercise of that lust of power; nor to what extent that exercise was at any time successful. The question is, whether the Roman Bishop has, by Christ's institution and by divine right, a claim to the allegiance of all the Churches of the earth; whether it can be proved from Scripture, that Christ designed, or from the testimonies of the primitive Church, that the Churches founded by the Apostles in all parts of the world acknowledged, such a supremacy in the Roman Bishop. To this question, the ante-Nicene Fathers, as well as Scripture, furnish a clear and decidedly negative answer; and I am not aware that I can more severely expose the gratuitous character of your assertions, than by simply transcribing, after all the evidence I have adduced, your confident

statement, that "there is *a very clear and ample recognition* of the designed succession to St. Peter in *the early Fathers*."

However, if any thing more were wanting, to establish incontrovertibly the fact, that Rome was not designed by Christ's institution to be the Centre of Unity, nor her Bishop the visible Supreme Head, of the Church Catholic; but that the kind of pre-eminence which as a matter of fact the Roman Church did attain, was entirely attributable to her local and political position; the proof is ready made to our hands in authentic documents, endorsed by the weight of two œcumenical Councils.

The *nature* of the Roman pre-eminence is thus declared by the first general Council of Constantinople, A°. 381, being the second* œcumenical Council:

---

* The silence of the Canons of the Council of Nice, with regard even to this "pre-eminence of honour," is a fact which should not be lost sight of. The only Canon of that Council, in which there is any mention of the Bishop of Rome, puts him expressly on a par with the Bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and others, who exercised a superior authority over the bishops of the provinces in which their Sees were situate. (*Concil. Nicæn. can.* vi.)—Another remarkable circumstance connected with the Council of Nice is, that the Council was summoned, opened, presided over, discharged, and its decrees promulgated, by the Emperor Constantine, and not by the Bishop of Rome, to whom it would obviously have appertained to have done all this, if he had really possessed, *jure divino*, a spiritual supremacy, or even, by

"Let the Bishop of Constantinople have *the pre-eminence of honour*, next after the Bishop of Rome; because Constantinople is New Rome."—*Concil. Constantin. Œcum.* ii. *can.* iii.

The *grounds* on which the pre-eminence of honour was so accorded by the Council of Constantinople, are further set forth by the Council of Chalcedon, A°. 451:

"Following throughout the decrees of the holy Fathers, and acknowledging the canon just read of the 150 God-beloved Bishops, [the 3d canon of the Council of Constantinople quoted above,] we also appoint and decree the like concerning the pre-eminence of the most holy Church of Constantinople, the New Rome. For *to the See of the elder Rome the Fathers properly*

---

universal concession, an ecclesiastical jurisdiction, over the Church Catholic throughout the world. (See the opening speech of Constantine to the assembled Fathers, the synodal letter of the Council itself, and the missives of Constantine promulgating its decrees, in *Gelas. Hist. Concil. Nicæni. lib.* ii. *c.* vii. xxxiii. xxxvi.; and generally the history of that Council, as it appears from the authentic documents). The Tridentine Fathers would have hurled their anathema pretty freely against any baptized sovereign, if he had attempted to call a general Council, or to direct its deliberations, in the way in which the unbaptized Constantine was suffered to do at the Council of Nice.

Much more to the same effect might be adduced from the acts of the other œcumenical Councils; but I must not further enlarge, remembering that my business is, not to write a history of the Papal usurpation, but only to furnish evidence of its non-existence in the early ages of the Church.

gave the pre-eminence on account of its being the imperial city; and moved by the same consideration, the 150 God-beloved Bishops awarded equal pre-eminence to the most holy See of New Rome, judging, with good reason, that *the city which is honoured by imperialty and a senate, and enjoys like privileges with the elder imperial city Rome, should also in ecclesiastical matters be magnified like her,* being second after her: and that the Metropolitans alone of the Pontic, Asiatic, and Thracian dioceses, together with the Bishops of those dioceses who labour among the barbarians, should be ordained by the aforesaid most holy See of the most holy Church at Constantinople; each Metropolitan, that is to say, of the aforesaid dioceses, together with the Bishops of the Province, ordaining the Bishops of the Province, as is set forth in the divine canons; but the Metropolitans themselves of the aforesaid dioceses being ordained, as before stated, by the Archbishop of Constantinople, consentient votes having been passed according to custom, and reported to him."—*Concil. Chalced. Œcum.* iv. *can.* xxviii.

Nothing, then, can be clearer, than that the pre-eminence of Rome was in its origin a pre-eminence of honour, not a supremacy, either of divine or human institution, making the apostolic powers, the catholic character, the orthodox faith, of all the Churches of the earth dependant, as you represent them to be, on the one point of communion with the Roman Church, or, more properly speaking, subjection to her Bishop.

It is time, however, that I should sum up my

argument. I have, in my third Letter, proved, that the doctrine of the Roman Church is diametrically opposed to the teaching of Scripture on the very threshold of truth, in the very elements of the Christian faith; in my fourth Letter I have taken off the mask from those fruits of holiness in which the Roman Church rejoices and glories; I have shown her boasted unity to be nothing more than a system of compromise upon every point but one, the maintenance of the Roman usurpation; I have demonstrated her assumption of universality to be no more than an impudent substitution of the part for the whole; I have shown that in her ancient character she is not old enough, and in her modern constitution much too young, to measure herself, in point of antiquity, against other branches of the Church Catholic; lastly, I have, in my present Letter, shown her arrogant claim to universal supremacy over God's Church to be without warrant in Scripture, and without foundation in history. This, sir, is my case against the Roman Church, and against your gratuitous assumptions in her favour. I have not dealt in assertions, but in evidence; and I challenge you* to show, that the evidence I have

* If you should see fit to respond to this challenge, I hope you will do so in open and manly guise; not in the covert manner in which I perceive that you have attempted to invalidate some of the proofs I brought against you in

adduced, is either unfairly obtained, or disingenuously applied. If you cannot show this, I have

my first Letter. It is not in the Anglican school, I am sure, that you have been taught at one and the same moment to answer, and to ignore, the arguments of your opponent. How come you, let me ask, to "waste" so much of your "paper" with disquisitions about Gregory and his objection to the title of Universal Bishop, in a pamphlet professing to be a reply to two only of your antagonists, neither of whom has even mentioned Gregory's name? Do you call that straightforward? Had you any doubts, perhaps, whether it might be altogether expedient to direct attention to the indignant language in which "St. Gregory condemned the assumption of the title of Universal Bishop?" Or, were you greedy of praise, fishing for golden opinions from the "Catholic Magazine," which, I am told, compliments you for your discretion in "passing by the Bibers, *et id genus omne?*"

However that may be, to show you that I am not a bit offended, I will wave my obvious right to take no notice of you, when you affect to take none of me; and give you the benefit of a rejoinder, though you have defrauded me of the honour of a reply. You have quoted four passages from the Epistles of Gregory, to prove that he did lay claim to the authority, though he repudiated the title, of Universal Bishop. Of the three first it will be sufficient to say, that they prove nothing more than what is distinctly implied in my statement, (Letter I. p. 30,) viz. a tendency to promote the patriarchal pre-eminence of the Roman See, and the conformity of other Churches with the customs of the Roman Church. I have not any where denied that the Roman Bishops were at all times ready to interfere in the affairs of other Churches, to extend the limits of their legitimate patriarchal authority, or the weight of that authority within those limits. What I denied was, your assumption that in the days of Gregory the Roman Bishop demanded, and the Church Catholic yielded, an "hearty allegiance to the See

made out my case against the Roman Church, as a Church which, however unquestionably a branch of Rome, in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, as divinely constituted to rule and consecrate the kingdom of Christ on earth." This point your three first quotations altogether fail to establish; the fourth seems, at first sight, to give it some countenance; but, let me ask you, have you read that letter from which you quote? (*Lib.* ix. *Ep.* 12, of the Benedictine edition; *Lib.* vii. *Ep.* 64, of Labbæus). I am induced to hope that you have not, because the context greatly diminishes the value of your extract. It appears that in those days, as in the present, small things were made of much importance, as badges of party; and certain warm partisans of the pre-eminence of the Roman See over that of Constantinople, had taken umbrage at what they imagined to be a conformity to the Greek usages, in some trifling matters of ritual observance in certain Churches of Sicily. Gregory, after discussing the points in question minutely, observes that there is no occasion to be so very punctilious, as the pre-eminence of the Apostolic See of Rome over the See of Constantinople was a point beyond dispute. Thus the remark of Gregory does not really imply more than the Canons of the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon before referred to. Very different would have been the purport of his remark, if the letter had treated of some point of vital importance touching the Divinely constituted Supremacy, in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, of the Roman See. Between the only one of your quotations therefore, which bears upon the point at all, and those which I have given, there is this difference, that yours is a mere *obiter dictum*, the force of which depends on the context, and in this case greatly loses by it; whereas mine are all taken from documents which expressly treat of the question in reference to which I have quoted them.

As you lay so much stress upon the "possession of the Apostolic chair of St. Peter," I would recommend to your

of the Church Catholic, yet is and must remain, until she repent and be converted from the error

attention the perusal of Gregory's letter to Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria, (*L.* vi. *Ep.* 37. *ed. Labb.*), where he distinctly recognises *three Apostolic chairs of St. Peter*, (Alexandria, Antioch and Rome,) and says: "Seeing, then, that *there is one See of the one Apostle, over which by divine authority three Bishops now preside*, I take to myself whatever good I hear of you." This is at least curious, and savours much more of Cyprian's notion of the one Catholic Episcopate, of which all the Bishops are joint-tenants, than of your notion of an exclusive and supreme succession of St. Peter in the Roman See.

Again, as you seem to think that the dispute turned upon the *name*, rather than the substantial rights, of the universal Episcopate, let me point out to you that that very objection was made to Gregory himself by the Emperor; and Gregory thereupon begs the Emperor to believe, that however trifling a thing may seem, it does not follow that it is harmless. "When Antichrist, he says, at his coming, shall call himself God, will not that be very trifling? and yet exceedingly pernicious. In point of speech it is only two syllables, but in point of iniquity, it is universal ruin." (*L.* vi. *Ep.* 30. *ad Mauric. Aug.*) Indeed it is impossible to read over the different epistles written by Gregory on this question, both to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and to the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, as well as to the Emperor, without perceiving that Gregory felt more to be at stake than an empty title.

I confess, I much admire the *poco curante* tone in which you follow up your quotations with the remark, that "if St. Gregory condemned the assumption of the title of Universal Bishop, he was not unwilling to exercise the authority." What! you charge so great a Bishop, so illustrious a Saint, with straining at the gnat of the name "Universal Bishop"

of her way, uncatholic in doctrine, uncatholic in practice, uncatholic in constitution, uncatholic in the position which she has assumed.*

That Church you have joined,—in deep ignorance, undoubtedly, of her true character; your choice was the blind man's choice of the brightest colour: because you had not, as I clearly showed in my second Letter, any correct conceptions of the Church of Christ, and consequently nothing to guide you in your search after the true Church.

so violently as to designate it a note of Antichrist, and a suggestion of the Devil; and at the same time swallowing the camel of an Universal Episcopate exercised by himself? It does not concern me to establish Gregory's consistency or honesty; for I neither pray to him, nor in any way rely upon him for the salvation of my soul. But I feel a veneration for him, which would cause me to make many an attempt to reconcile his inconsistencies upon a charitable hypothesis, before I could bring myself to the conclusion at which you seem to have arrived *per saltum*, at the risk of affronting one of your heavenly patrons by a breach of the ninth (your eighth) Commandment.

* My attention has been so much directed to the essentially uncatholic character of the Roman Church herself, that I have not had an opportunity of adverting to the peculiarly schismatical character of her position in this country. By her own showing she is not a Church, but only a *Mission* in England. You are, strictly speaking, a Missionary now, whose vocation is, to seduce as many as he can from that Church in which he was baptized, to whom he is indebted for his Christian covenant-position, and his acquaintance with Christian truth, at whose altars he has long been ministering in God's holy name!!

The very fact of your searching after the true Church is an evidence of your blindness; for, as I pointed out to you in my first Letter, you had long been in the true Church, and you knew it not, although for years you had stood and ministered in her sanctuary: because in tendering her your services, and accepting her heavenly commission, you came not with a heart purified from the idol of your youth. You swore to her with your lips, while your mind was unacquainted with her principles, and your heart dead to her spiritual realities.

Such are the grounds on which I have a right to say, that I have made out my premises, as laid down at the commencement of my correspondence with you, viz. that you were uncatholic while a member of the Catholic Church of England; that you have, upon uncatholic grounds, joined an uncatholic Church; whence the conclusion inevitably follows, that you are not now, nor ever were, a Catholic.

But, sir, though I feel that I may claim the victory, it is not for the sake of victory that I have engaged in this controversy with you. In making an attack upon the Anglican Church, you defied,—though this too you knew not,—"the armies of the living God." Your note of defiance called for an answer; Rome had entitled herself,

in the person of you her trumpeter, to another exposure of the blasphemous imposture by which she deceives the nations; the members of the Anglican Church had a right to be protected from the insidious fallacies by which you assailed their faith; yea, and you yourself, sir, had a strong claim upon the endeavours of your brethren, to rescue you, if possible, from the power of that "strong delusion," which had taken fatal advantage of your unenlightened judgment and your misguided feelings.

On this last point suffer me to say, in conclusion, a few words.

You have sinned, most fearfully, against God: you sought him not in the living reality of his spiritual presence, in the mysterious truth of his undefiled ordinance; that was a grievous sin: you now seek him under the dead semblance of a carnal presence, in the lying mystery of his ordinance falsified; that is a sin still more grievous. This is a matter between God and your soul: we may point it out, and we may pray for you; we dare not intermeddle with it.

But you have sinned, moreover, most grievously against God's Church; in one of her branches, one whom both natural affection and solemn vows ought to have protected from such treachery at your hands, you have become the

cause of great offence. Remember that which is written: "It is impossible but that offences will come: but woe unto him through whom they come." This is a case for remonstrance as public as the offence has been; and in the name of that Church, in whom, as in a member, you have offended against the whole body of the Church Catholic, I now call upon you to clear yourself of these two charges,

1. That by the loose and latitudinarian spirit in which you took upon you, and exercised, the ministry of the Anglican Church, you who had, solemnly and in the sight of God, undertaken to maintain her Scriptural principles, and to carry on her holy work, did in fact, while continuing under her banner, so misrepresent her character, and so vilify her principles, as to bring her into contempt, even in your own eyes; receiving her commission, and then using the power which, in reliance upon the sincerity of the offer which you made her of your services, she committed to your hands, for the purpose of subverting her authority.

2. That by the rash and unconscientious dereliction of your sworn engagements, and by the inconsiderate haste with which you rushed, not only into the communion, but at once into the Ministry, of the Roman Church, you who once

did, solemnly and in the sight of God, acknowledge the Anglican Church to be God's ordinance, and her Bishops Christ's representatives, now calumniously insinuate, that there is no God in her, and no Christ represented by her Chief Pastors; thus not resting content with the sin of desertion, but adding to it the more heinous sin of active treachery.

These are heavy charges: you cannot deny it; nor can you, I think, avoid to perceive, that there is a strong *primâ facie* case made out against you. If you wish to retain the least title to the character of a moral agent, you have no alternative left; you must either clear yourself from these charges, or you must repent of the sin which you have committed, and at whatever cost of self-abasement, of bitter and lasting mortification, make, by a public confession of your fault, the only reparation in your power to the offended Church of God.

I am aware, sir, that the call to repentance, which I have now made upon you, is one which, after the steps you have taken, it seems humanly impossible that you should answer. But I know and believe, that "the things which are impossible with men, are possible with God;" and therefore I shall not cease, in common with many, I am sure, of your late brethren in the Ministry, to

remember you fervently in the prayer constantly offered by us, that it may please the Lord of all power and might, "to bring into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived."

Believe me, in all sincerity,

Your faithful brother in the Lord,

G. E. B.

COOMBE WOOD,
March 11, 1842.

☞ In Letter IV. p. 32, there is a misprint which totally obscures the sense. For "*practices*," line 7, read "*concessions*."

Price 1*s.* 6*d. each,* LETTERS I. to IV. OF

CATHOLICITY v. SIBTHORP;

Or, Some Help to answer the question, whether the REV. R. W. SIBTHORP, B.D. is now or ever was a Catholic?

In a series of Letters addressed to him by the REV. G. E. BIBER, LL.D., Presbyter of the Anglo-Catholic Church.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

1 *Vol.* 8*vo. Price* 14*s.*,

THE STANDARD OF CATHOLICITY,

Or an Attempt to point out in a plain Manner certain safe and leading Principles, amidst the conflicting Opinions by which the Church is at present agitated.

Price 1*s.*

OUR DAY OF SIFTING:

A plain SERMON for these perplexing Times, preached on New Year's Day, 1842, at St. Andrew's Church, Ham.

Also, Price 1*s.*,

THE LORD'S HOUSE:

A SERMON, preached on Sunday Evening, October 24th, 1841, at the *Chapel of Ease, Robinhood Hamlet,* in aid of the Funds now collecting for the Endowment of the said Chapel.

Published by Request, in aid of the Endowment Fund.

Also, Price 1*s.* 6*d.*,

THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

RECOMMENDED TO THE YOUNG,

IN A LETTER ADDRESSED TO HIS PUPILS.

And, Price 1*s.* 6*d.*,

GOD'S HOLY PRESENCE.

A LETTER ADDRESSED TO HIS PUPILS.